









57.

DEDICATED TO THE ILLUSTRIOS DESCENDANT OF  
PRINCE FRÉDERICK, ELECTOR OF SAXONY, &c.

# LUTHER IN ENGLAND;

OR, AN

ANSWER BY ANTICIPATION

TO A

CERTAIN MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT, AND  
STUDENT OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD.

ORIGINALLY WRITTEN

IN REPLY TO THAT FIRST AND MOST FAMOUS DEFENDER OF  
THE (ROMISH) FAITH, AND SUPREME HEAD OF THE  
CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

KING HENRY THE EIGHTH.

EDITED BY

A LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE.

"Thou must prophecy again before many peoples, and nations, and tongues,  
and kings."—Rev. x. 11.

LONDON :

E. PALMER AND SON, PATERNOSTER ROW,

1841.

[Price One Shilling and Sixpence.]





DEDICATED TO THE ILLUSTRIOS DESCENDANT OF  
PRINCE FREDERIC, ELECTOR OF SAXONY, &c.

---

# LUTHER IN ENGLAND;

OR, AN

ANSWER BY ANTICIPATION

TO A

CERTAIN MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT, AND  
STUDENT OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD.

ORIGINALLY WRITTEN

IN REPLY TO THAT FIRST AND MOST FAMOUS DEFENDER OF  
THE (ROMISH) FAITH, AND SUPREME HEAD OF THE  
CHURCH OF ENGLAND,

KING HENRY THE EIGHTH.

EDITED BY

A LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE.

"Thou must prophecy again before many peoples, and nations, and tongues,  
and KINGS."—Rev. x. 11.

LONDON:

E. PALMER AND SON, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1841.

London:  
E. Palmer and Son, Printers,  
18, Paternoster Row.



## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

THE subjects of the following Treatise are Tradition and the Sacraments,—with some strictures on the imposition of Articles of Faith by human authority ; all of which our author treats in a most masterly manner.

The Editor does not feel called upon to apologize either for the style or sentiments of this publication. They are not his, but Luther's; though, if any apology were necessary, the apology of Pomeranus might perhaps be sufficient. “ At first, he thought Luther had been too violent in his answer to Henry the Eighth ; but he changed his opinion, and declared that the author had used the English monarch with too much lenity. ‘ I am convinced, (says he,) the Holy Ghost is with Luther; he is a man of an honest, holy, firm, and invincible spirit.’ ”—Melch. Ad :

Yet who shall apologize for him of whom God ap-

proveth ? It is God that justifieth : who is he that condemneth ?

Should there be any errors in the translation, however,—and the Editor cannot flatter himself that it is altogether faultless,—for these he holds himself responsible, and shall feel obliged to any one, either friend or foe, who will point them out in order to their future correction.

## LUTHER AGAINST THE KING OF ENGLAND.

---

OUR Lord Jesus Christ hath struck that whole kingdom of the popish abomination with such a degree of blindness and madness, that those innumerable Cyclops, making war now for three whole years with one Luther, cannot yet comprehend for what I make war with them; so many books having been published in vain by me, plainly testifying that this is my only object—namely, that the divine scriptures should reign alone, as is fit and right; and human inventions and traditions be taken out of the way, as most pestilential offences: or, at least, that their venom being drawn, and their sting extracted, (that is, the power of compelling and commanding, and of ensnaring consciences being taken away,) they be tolerated as free and indifferent, like any other pest or unhappiness of the world. For they, struck with a perpetual madness, bring nothing against me but the decrees of men, the glosses of fathers, and the acts or rites of ages; those very things, forsooth, which I deny and impugn, and which they themselves also confess are faithless and have often been erroneous. I dispute of matter of right, and they answer me on matter of fact. I demand a reason; they exhibit a work. I ask, By what power do ye these things? they say, Because we so do and have done them. Let our will stand for reason—practice for authority—custom for right, and that in the matters of God.

They have among themselves in their schools a most vicious kind of reasoning which they call “begging the question.” This these miserable men learn and teach even

to grey hairs, yea to the very sepulchre, with vast labour and expense. But when they come to the use of their learning, they can do nothing else except thus most viciously beg the question. Thus it comes to pass that I exclaim “The gospel, the gospel! Christ, Christ!” while they answer “The fathers, the fathers! custom, custom! the decrees, the decrees!” But when I say that the fathers, custom, and the decrees have often erred, and that we ought to fortify ourselves with some stronger and more certain authority than these—while Christ cannot by possibility err; when I say thus, they, more mute than fishes, or, as the scripture says, like deaf adders, shut their ears, that they may not hear the voice of the charmer. Or hear again what always floats on the top of their tongue: they reply to me, “So says Ambrose; are you more learned than Ambrose? are you the only wise man in the world?” and nothing besides. As if our disputation were about the doctrine of Ambrose and mine; or as if I could not say “You misunderstand and pervert Ambrose.” I beseech you what end is there of disputing with such blind, mad, and infatuated persons?

Such also is this book of the King of England, who throughout his whole work does nothing else than press me with the traditions of men, and the glosses of fathers, and the usage of ages. He rages, he abuses, he is all reproaches and venom, that I wish to be accounted more learned, more holy and greater than they. He is not content that I allow such things to them, so as they are accounted free; but this new god would make for us new articles of faith of whatever he has found said or done of men; whom except I believe, with what madness is he not enflamed to make of me an heretic, and I know not what monster beside. I beseech you, whence is this new god the King of England a creator of new articles of faith for us? I have known but one God as yet who had a right to make articles of faith, and to require our belief of them. But beyond other madmen this new god hath imported a new kind of

fury. For they endeavoured in some way to pervert the scriptures that were brought by me, and to make them different from their proper sense; attempting nothing without the name, at least, and the pretence of the scripture. But this god, insolent beyond measure, with his new divinity, and assured that whatever he shall say ought either to be done or to have been done, declares professedly, that he would dismiss my principal foundation, and leave it to be besieged by others, while he overthrows the building alone—that is, with straw and stubble fights against the rock of God's word. So that you can scarce tell whether madness could rage in such a manner, or folly itself be so foolish, as is this head of our Henry—perchance to make the proverb true, that he must either have been born a king or a fool. For what fool would say thus?—"I will maintain the seven sacraments, but will leave untouched the principal strength of my adversary." You might suppose that this book were published by some notable enemy of the king to his majesty's eternal disgrace.

But lest the name of so great a king should seem to be despised by me, and that I may answer a fool according to his folly, I will make manifest his folly in a little book, as far as my occupations will allow me, intending to handle another time this piece of blasphemous and abusive royalty more largely and according to his dignity. For what no one almost believes, that this is a king's book, moves me not. I am willing it should be the king's whose title it bears, and I will turn my attack on this foolish king who has suffered certain sophistical fellows to abuse his name, and to fill the whole book with such lies and virulence, that this son of a Leo, or personification of such, can be expressed by no image more readily;—some heavy headed and phlegmatic sophist, forsooth, such as those stupid swine the Thomists are wont to nourish in their flock;—lest to the English Pharaoh likewise should be wanting a Jannes and Jambres.

Let not king Henry, therefore, impute it to me, but to

himself, if he be handled by me a little too roughly and severely: for he comes not forth with a royal mind, or with any vein of blood royal, but plainly with a servile, impudent, and harlot's assurance and folly; proving all things no otherwise than by slanders, and, what is most disgraceful in any man, much more in a man of rank, he openly and designedly lies, so that you may discover the sophist made up of ignorance and virulence. Some indulgence might be shewed him if he erred after a human sort, but now, since he knowingly and wilfully invents falsehoods against the majesty of my King in heaven,—a mere worm doomed to corruption,—I must have leave, on behalf of my King, to cover even the majesty of England with his own mud and filth, and to tread under foot that crown which blasphemeth against Christ.

Then, since it is plain that the Thomists are so stupid and lethargic a kind of sophists, that human nature hath produced nothing more dull and sluggish; and since our king Henry would, in this book, seem a most famous Thomist; whilst amongst other things he dreams and snores of the sacramental character and efficacy in water,—prodigies which his companions in the schools, the very sophists themselves, can no longer endure,—it seemed necessary that he should be plucked with sharp words, if by any means he could be roused from his most profound lethargy, and hear his own dreams and vain lethargic imaginations. Since for no other reason does this book so please our sophistical neighbours, than that it is egregiously Thomistical, and that the vessel tastes of their liquors.

If I have trodden under foot the idol of the Roman abomination for Christ's sake, because he had put himself in the place of God, and made himself master of kings, and of the whole world; who is this Henry, a new Thomist and disciple only of so sluggish a monster, that I should respect his virulent blasphemies? Let him be defender of the church, but of that church which he boasts of and defends in this book, namely, the purple harlot, and drunken—the mother of for-

nications. I, accounting both his church and its defender alike, will attack both at once, and, under Christ's guidance, will overcome them.

For certain I am that I have my doctrines from heaven, which I have triumphantly supported, even against him who has more power and cunning in the extremity of his finger than all popes, and kings, and doctors—so that they do nothing to the purpose who boast against me the bulls of names and titles, and hawk about books under royal inscriptions. My doctrines shall stand, and the pope shall fall, in spite of all the gates of hell, and powers of earth, air, and sea. They have provoked me to war, and war they shall have; they have despised the proffer of peace, and therefore peace shall be far from them. Let God see to it, which shall fail first through weariness—the Pope or Luther. So I am resolved, in Christ, to grow daily more and more haughty against these insipid and foolish basilisks, the more they themselves rage.

But, before we come to the matter itself, I will dispose of two charges which this Thomistical king, in his womanish impotence, brings against me. The one of these is, that I am often contradictory to myself. This his impudent falsehood, even contrary to his own conscience, he so urges and puts forward throughout his whole book, that it is sufficiently apparent that he did not write this little book from a desire of instructing, or, as he himself pretends, of maintaining the seven sacraments,—but from the disease of his own most virulent spirit, whereby when he could not eject, or digest, the poisonous humour of envy and malice, which he had conceived, downwards,—he took occasion of vomiting it upwards by his impudent mouth, regarding nothing but that he might besmear the faces of all with his lies, and raise a prejudice against me. It were most foul, indeed, for even a vile harlot to lie and rage so, with such an impudent forehead and an impotent mind. Other things would have become the soul and blood of a king. Another charge is, that I have re-

proached the pontiff and the church—that is, the lion and the bawd, and the seat of Satan, of which he himself hath lately been declared “the Defender with indulgences.”

That I may publish his impudent falsehood, therefore, through the world, it is fit that I should here recount, in order, the subjects on which I have written; whereof there are two kinds—the first is of those which are taught in the sacred scriptures, namely, 1, of faith; 2, of charity; 3, of hope; 4, of works; 5, of sufferings; 6, of baptism; 7, of repentance; 8, of the Lord’s supper; 9, of the law; 10, of sins; 11, of death; 12, of free will; 13, of grace; 14, of Christ; 15, of God; 16, of the last judgment; 17, of heaven; 18, of hell; 19, of the church; and, 20, of such like. For these are the heads of the subjects which a christian ought to know, and which are necessary to salvation. These I have so handled that no one can convict me of having ever thought otherwise than I thought from the very first of my writing. I have never contradicted myself, but have always persevered in the same mind, and like myself from the beginning. My books yet extant are my witnesses, and all who have read them; the condemned conscience of this lying king is also a witness.

Then who would believe that so great a king would not only dare to invent this boasting, that I contradict myself, but openly to assert, also, that I have so taught faith that I would both make void good works, and give a licence to evil ones. As if there were not men living who have read my writings, and could confute his impudent falsehood, when his own conscience even convicts him, as testifying himself, that he hath read my writings in great part; so that it were superfluous almost to answer this king who has gone to such lengths in falsehood. He ought to have taken care, in the first place, when he was going to write against heretics, that not even a suspicion of falsehood could be detected in him, whereas now he hath wrapped himself up entirely in lies. Who can believe any part of his writings when, throughout

his whole book, he so often repeats and inculcates so great a falsehood. This progeny of the viper shews the disposition of its nature, and imitates the example of its parents, for so they charged on Paul, also, when he taught that all the sons of Adam are justified by faith, without works, as he writes Rom. iii. There are who say that we teach "Let us do evil that good may come." But what judgment awaits them? "Whose damnation (says he) is just." And what shall I say to my basilisk, concerning his lie, but pronounce the same judgment of damnation.

Another kind is of those subjects which are beside the scripture—namely, 1. of the papacy; 2. of decrees of councils; 3. of teachers; 4. of indulgences; 5. of purgatory: 6. of the mass; 7. of universities; 8. of monastic vows; 9. of **IDOL BISHOPS**; 10. of human traditions; 11. of the worship of saints; and 12. of new sacraments. And if there are any such like things—the tares, forsooth, sown by Satan through the influence of his Roman idol in the field of the Lord—which the church cannot only do very well without, but cannot even consist except it be without them, or use them at its free pleasure. For nothing more pestilential can be taught in the church, than if those things which are not necessary be made necessary; since by this tyranny consciences are ensnared, and the liberty of faith extinguished—a lie is worshipped for truth, an idol for God, and an abomination for holiness.

Since therefore the sacred scripture has nothing of these things, the mad papists, those masters of lies and makers of idols, have begun to think it a business worthy of themselves, forsooth, to twist and pervert the whole scripture to their poisonous lies; so that they have made those places which taught of faith a foundation for the popedom, and those which prescribed humility to support the pomp of tyranny. Whilst they have thrown all things into confusion by their extreme lying, and have abolished the whole scripture; the shrine of the Roman beast, possessed with a most wicked

devil, reigning in its stead. Thus they have made the rock of an invincible faith (Matt. xvi.) the papacy, and the Pope, —who have not only been overcome with most foul errors and sins, but are overwhelmed and absorbed in daily examples of abominations. So when Christ teaches that there is no one great in the church except he be servant of all, they have put another handle to this sentence, and determined that there is nothing but what is great in the church of God.

These monsters of abominations thus raging, the Lord carried me, without knowing it, into the midst of these disturbances, and, by occasion of the fallacious indulgences, granted me to wrest some places of Scripture from Satan, like the club from the hand of Hercules, and to restore them to the genuine sense of the Spirit. Here, as God liveth, with what an impetuosity did their fury begin to foam—ready to confound heaven with earth, and fire with water. Not able to endure, forsooth, that its borrowed plumage should be plucked from their jackdaw, with which they had decked it out so famously for the Vicar of Christ. But I, at first, handled this jackdaw with moderation and reverence enough, insisting on this, principally, that the papacy was *something*, being ignorant that it was diametrically opposed to the whole Scripture. But I was content to clear the Scriptures alone, thinking that the papacy was some such thing as are the kingdoms and principalities of men. But they, hardened by the long usage of their tyranny, and elated by the success of their fraud hitherto, according to Daniel, despised my moderation and reverence, presuming to put their idol in the place of God, and to confound it with the heart of the Scriptures.

But Christ gave me a spirit of signal contempt both for the fraud and fury of the papists, and caused that the more I cleared the Scriptures, the more certainly I discovered the abomination that has been woven into them. Until the matter came to that pass, by the hand of the mighty Jacob, that it was clear, by manifest and pure scriptures, that the pope, cardinals, bishops, priests, monks, nuns, masses, and that

whole kingdom, with its doctrines and ministrations, is nothing else but mere monsters, idols, masks, lies, and the very abomination standing in the holy place,—prostituting itself under the title of true bishops and the church,—that purple whore, forsooth, sitting upon the many-headed beast, drunk with the blood of the witnesses of Christ, and making the kings of the earth drunk with the cup of her fornications and abominations. Of all which things Peter foretold—“ False teachers shall bring in damnable heresies, denying the Lord who bought them, blaspheming the way of truth, and with feigned words, through covetousness, making merchandise of you.”

For this is the one madness of this sacrilegious people, that they would come before God by works, not faith alone. Whence of necessity Christ must be denied and faith made void, while gains increase, and the wealth of the whole world is absorbed for their masses and vigils. For so does this most perverse offspring of abomination pervert all things. Works which we ought to exhibit towards men, they offer to God ; but faith, by which alone we can serve God, they attribute to men. For they believe all human doctrines, but believe not God. Again, they do good to no man, but\* do service to God.

This truth, therefore, being acknowledged, I am constrained to retract some of those things I have said, for good, of the papacy ; and of those things which are taught *beside* the Scriptures. Lastly, I yet revoke, and from my soul am sorry, if at any time I have written one syllable, for good, of the Pope and his kingdom. And I entreat my readers that they will deign, prudently, to beware of the like errors with mine. Moreover, what hath made this masked king an insane Thomist, in my book of “ The Babylonish Captivity,” I also revoke, and confess that I have said less than I ought.

\* This expression of “ doing God service ” is no stranger elsewhere than at Rome. It resounds every Sunday in our University pulpits.—ED.

For it were too much honour and glory to say—that the popedom is “the rude hunting of a Roman bishop;” for that example of Nimrod suits also all profane princes ; to whom God would yet have us in subjection, to honour, bless, and pray for them.

I say thus, more truly of the papacy. The papacy is the most pestilent abomination of that prince Satan, which ever was or will be under heaven. Thus I revoke my book of the Babylonish captivity, to please our lord Henry—that new Thomist, lest so great majesty of his Thomistical name should burst with anger ; for this retraction does so learned and terrible a Thomist extort from me. And lest there should be no power of moving Luther in his little book, he hath added threats, plainly advising that this heretic should be burnt unless he repent. And this in a most Thomistical manner ; for it is certain that Luther will be alarmed by these threats, and will follow whatever his Thomistical wisdom invents and babbles in this book of a king.

These are the arms by which heretics are overcome at this day—namely, the fire and fury of these most insipid asses and Thomistical swine. But let the swine go on, and burn me if they dare. Here I am, and will wait their approach ; and by my ashes alone after death, though they were cast into a thousand seas, I will persecute and vex this abominable herd. In fine, while I live, I will be the plague of the popedom ; and being burnt, I will be its enemy twice over. Do what ye can, ye swine of Thomists, ye shall have Luther as a bear in your way, and a lioness in your path. He will meet you every where, and will not suffer you to have peace, until he have subdued your iron necks and brazen foreheads, either to repentance or perdition. Thus far it shall be enough to have lost patience. In future, since ye go on hardened and blinded to lift up your horns, and have wilfully become incorrigible and unsubdued, let no one expect that anything shall be said by me henceforth toward you deplorable monsters, either soft or kind. For I wish you more and more

irritated, until all your strength and fury being poured out, you fall upon yourselves. Let him who first shall quell the other be accounted victor. As you wish, so let it be done unto you.

That I may return, therefore, to that most famous piece of Thomistical wisdom of the king, whereby he condemns me as writing things contradictory, and in no part consistent with myself. This miserable book-maker, labouring no doubt under a want of matter, hath shown by his virulent language how much paper he can consume, which is truly a royal work. But with what confidence he does this, the good reader may judge hence, that this masked Thomist doth not bring forward even one passage, by way of example, at least, to convict me of inconstancy. 'This vain-glorious king only flourishes after this manner: "Luther contradicts himself, who can believe him?"' To have said so was sufficient for this new Defender of the church, and deity lately born in England; but to give an example was not necessary, lest Luther should have an opportunity of purging himself, and of treating this foolish king according to his Thomistical dignity.

Since, therefore, it has pleased this mask to play thus with masked words, without an example in a matter so serious and sacred, I, without a mask, and openly, assert, that the King of England, this Henry, plainly lies, and becomes the character of the lightest buffoon, rather than of a king, with his falsehoods. Of this crime I Luther openly accuse this virulent Thomist, and, on the evidence both of my books and my readers, I convict him throughout the world. Let his royal majesty and my humility have nothing to do in this matter. I speak with a lying buffoon, covered with royal titles, about divine things, to protect which against injurious falsehoods is the business of any christian. If a foolish king so forgets his royal majesty as to dare to come forward in public with open lies, and *that* in treating of sacred matters, why should it not be fair for me to cast back his lies again to

his face, so that, if he have conceived any pleasure by lying against the Divine Majesty, he may lose it again by hearing the truth against *his* majesty.

For neither am I here called to the exercise of patience, when this light buffoon assails not me with his lies, nor my life, which I could have borne, but that doctrine which I am most certain is not mine but Christ's. Let him impute it to himself, therefore, and to his lies, if he be compelled to hear things unworthy of a royal name. His foul mouth hath deserved this, because he hath bespattered my King, who is the King of Glory, with his blasphemies. For it is not my doctrine which is in any way inconsistent with itself, or can be, since it is Christ's. And it is now plain to the whole world, that I have always been of the same opinion concerning faith, charity, works, and those things which the Spirit of Christ hath taught us out of the sacred scriptures—that I have always taught and written the same things, although by use and study I have daily made more and more proficiency, and have taught the same things, now in one way and now in another—sometimes more clearly, sometimes more diffusely, sometimes more copiously and variously—in the same way as the sacred scriptures themselves treat the same matters.

But if he will, that I am not consistent with myself in these matters which I have handled *beside* the scripture, namely, about the Pope, indulgences, masses, and tares of that kind, in which I dissented with modesty at the first, afterwards altogether condemned, (that I may excuse in so great a king this falsehood, which he invents against the man Luther) : who does not see his folly and Thomistical dulness, who, with all his Thomisticity, hath not yet made that proficiency to know, what propositions are contradictory and what not. Come, vain-glorious Thomist, to my school, and I will teach you what it is for doctrines to be contradictory.

If this be—to be not consistent in doctrine, as this Thomistical king defines it—should any one think otherwise,

after he hath discovered the truth and renounced his error, than he thought before?—I beseech you, which of the wisest or most holy men was ever consistent with himself? We shall condemn the whole epistles of Paul because he, after his conversion, calls those things altogether dung which before, in his Judaism, had been to him gain. We may condemn Augustine likewise, who in a single book hath retracted many things, and taught things quite contrary to what he taught at first. But according to the inestimable wisdom of this king, let sinners cease to repent, and to change their minds for the better, lest this wrathful King of England should publish a book to convict them of inconsistency and of self-disagreement.

And why doth not this king measure himself by his own wisdom, and drink wine now, who formerly sucked his nurse's milk? Why is he now armed in iron, who formerly wore boy's buskins? Lastly, why doth he condemn in me what he does himself? For in this very book he praises me, because I before approved the Pope; and again condemns me, because I afterwards rejected him. Why therefore am I not allowed, likewise, to think differently of the popedom than I *did* think, and to change my errors for a better opinion? Who indeed would believe that so great a king could dote in so foolish a manner? Except he were a Thomist, and had declared himself serious in his other virulent lies, he might have appeared to be joking, as in the days of masks.

These rather are contradictory doctrines, when you have taught things contrary at the same time,—have at the same time contradicted and asserted, disclaiming neither: in the way the mad papists contradict themselves, when (Matt. xvi) they make the “Rock” both Christ and the Pope: whereas Christ is holy, and the Pope impious; and there is the same agreement between holiness and impiety, as between light and darkness, or Christ and Belial. For so the papacy consists not, or rather falls not in, but with the most inconsistent,

contradictory, and false doctrines; both of which it teaches at the same time, as opponent, and respondent. Let the reader see, therefore, by this one argument, what is the asinine rudeness of these Thomists, or their puerile impotence of mind, which will not suffer them to understand their own words, and yet they will venture to write defences of the sacraments, and to utter great swelling words, the witnesses of their incredible ignorance. For I think that this book of the king was written for this very purpose, lest the world should suppose that the stupidity and folly of the sophists, especially of those swine, I mean the Thomists, was falsely traduced by me. For my judgment was to be approved and confirmed by this their own work and seal.

To the other fault,—namely, of severity,—with which the king charges me, I answer—first, that he ought to have proved that my severity was wicked, and the popedom innocent. Otherwise why doth Christ himself (Matt. xxiii) inveigh against the Scribes and Pharisees with such vehemence, and call them hypocrites, blind, fools, full of uncleanness, hypocrisy, murderers? And Paul, how often is he vehement against his concision, as he calls them, and false apostles, whom he charges as adulterating and making merchandize of the word of God, calling them dogs, deceitful workers, apostles of Satan, children of the devil, full of deceit and wickedness, deceivers, vain talkers, bewitchers, and mountebanks. Will this masked Thomist accuse these, as well as me, of envy and pride?

But that he may fully exhibit his Thomistical brain, and plebeian disposition, as if he were acting the part of a player on the stage, he thus rages against me with slanders, reproaches, and lies; and yet proves none of these things of me before-hand. So that there seems no other reason for condemning my mordacity, than that he may justify that rage of slander with these foul Thomists, and may deserve the Thomistical crown.

Blockhead indeed! because he knows abundantly well that

the papacy is accounted by me for the kingdom of Antichrist —against which even Job commands evil to be spoken by those who are prepared to stir up this Leviathan. And every where the Spirit requires us to convince the world of the sin of impiety ; and not only commands, but demands this altogether holy and just severity.

But the king, as if he had obtained this point that the popedom is holy by virtue of his virulence and slander, rages against my severity. But, as I said before, he wished to act the hypocrite, and mask of the Thomists, with whom it is the extreme of perfidy, and height of heresy, not to have adored our masters, (though they be the pests of the world,) as the angels of God. To have muttered aught against their nod—this at length is a crime not to be sufficiently expiated by fire.

But I, who have hitherto been a little too merciful toward these papistical monsters, under the hope of their repentance, now when I see them, who are such, given up to a reprobate mind, and with a deplorable pertinacity to have gone to their place with their leader Pharaoh, will use no more moderation nor mercy toward them. Nor will I more entrust the reins of my pen to my friends, but in silence will despise them. Or, if I must have to do with them, I will attack them with all the force I can, to irritate them abundantly, to provoke these stupid trunks, these rude asses, and dull swine, since they are worthy of no other treatment than to be provoked to their own destruction. And this I will do to the glory of that Henrician church, and of Henry himself, that most famous defender and Thomist, lest he should have to complain that with his most sacred slander he hath condemned my severity in vain.

But let us now come to the matter itself, and after the manner of Aristotle, who is the god of these Thomists, let us dispute first generally, and then particularly of these questions. The chief, general, and only strength of this Henrician wisdom in this so royal a book, is no authority of

scripture, no cogent reason, but that Thomistical form of disputing,—“ So it seems to me;” “ So I think;” “ So I believe.” And, that I may here remember my Ambsdorff—so disputes this foolish king, as he is wont to tell, that the theologists in his day disputed. When the respondent had denied the assumption of the opponent, the opponent proved the same thing in this manner: “ It must needs be so.” The other again denying it, he rejoined, “ And how can it be otherwise?” “ It must needs be so.” Most beautifully, and Thomistically, and moreover most Henricianly argued indeed!

So when I, in my little book on the “ Babylonish Captivity,” chiefly impugned this Thomistical general principle, and maintained the divine Scriptures against rite, usage, custom, and authority of men, our lord Henry, notwithstanding, according to his Thomistical wisdom, makes no other reply, than, “ So it must needs be;” “ Such is the usage;” “ So is long custom;” “ So I believe;” “ So the fathers have written;” “ So the church hath ordained;” &c. But if I should write again a thousand books, and should prove by the Scriptures that use, and the authority of men, is of no avail in matters of faith, it will be easy, also, for this Thomistical king to reply in a thousand books, and omitting the scriptures adduced by me, to be always repeating, “ So it must needs be;” “ Such is the usage;” “ So says the authority of men;” and nothing beside. But if I shall say, “ How do you prove that usage and the authority of men is of any weight?” he answers, “ So it must needs be;” “ So it seems to me;” “ So I believe;” “ Are you alone more learned than all the world beside?”

You understand, therefore, reader, that these intractable blockheads aim at this only, that we may believe them alone. I demand faith, not in myself, but in the clear words of God. They require that we should believe the rank and drowsy visions of their brain to the contempt of God’s word. Yet neither have I denied either the usage or authority of men,

altogether, but wish those things to be free and indifferent, whatever have been written beside the Holy Scriptures. Only I protest against necessary articles of faith being made of the works of men. I would have those things to be tolerated, which have been well said or done, beside the testimony of Scripture; but I would have them tolerated freely. Yet these blockheads make articles of faith for us of every word of the fathers, which was so far from the wish of the saints themselves, that it should be attributed to their writings, that you could not offend them by any greater blasphemy, than whilst their free words and deeds are turned by these lethargic Thomists into necessary articles—that is, lying snares to the destruction of souls.

Let this, then, be my general answer to all these sinks of this most insipid mask of Thomists, which he gathers together in his book. And I divide them into two kinds, after this manner—if he alleges usage, and the authority of men to be such, as manifestly contradicts the Scripture, let it be anathema—usage, authority, king, Thomist, sophist, Satan, yea and an angel from heaven. For nothing ought to prevail against the Scripture; but all things for the Scripture's sake.

Such is what this foolish king produces concerning one part of the sacrament, where, in his Thomistical madness, he even contends, that usage is of force, for an article of faith, even against the most plain text of the gospel; as we shall see,—a madness under which no heretics have yet laboured. For hitherto heretics have used the Scriptures, in shew at least; none have openly condemned them. The papists and Thomists alone, those dregs of the last abominations, have assumed this forehead of a whore, to confess that the sacred Scriptures mean so and so, and yet they would not have it so to be thought. Not even Satan himself so openly and directly blasphemeth the Divine Majesty, and accuses him of falsehood to his face.

But if he alleges that usage and authority of men, which are not at variance with the Scriptures, I do not condemn,

but would tolerate them, with this proviso only, that Christian liberty should be preserved, and that it should be at our pleasure to adopt those things—to hold or change them—when, where, and as we please. But if they wish to captivate this liberty of ours, and attempt to make necessary articles of faith, again, I say, “Let him be anathema, who hath thus presumed, whether he be an insipid Thomist or a stupid papist, a king, or a pope.”

Such is what our lord Henry urges for articles of faith, namely, his sacraments of confirmation, matrimony, orders, unction, and the mixture of water with wine, &c.

But for our part, against this Thomistical straw and stubble, those divine lightnings are more than sufficient, where Christ (Matt. xv.) determines of *all* human traditions, saying, “Without cause they worship me by the doctrines and commandments of men.” What are the whole dregs of this masked Thomist against this one word of Christ, that I may pass by many others mentioned elsewhere? If it is in vain whatever is commanded of men, with what face can this foolish king make articles of faith for us out of it. Therefore by this word of Christ alone, lies prostrate this unhappy and miserable defender of the Henrician church, with his whole book.

Where are you, my lord Henry? produce your famous book against Luther. What doth your lordship maintain? Seven sacraments? By what doctrines? Of God or of men? Then let your Thomistical lordship hear the judgment, not of Luther, but of Him at whom the foundations of the world tremble. “In vain they worship me by the doctrines of men.” Let your lordship go and teach their papistical lordships this vain faith and religion, and defend it strenuously as you best can. But withhold your lordship’s foul and sacrilegious mouth from the church of God, which admits nothing but the word of God.

Lastly, so foolish is this proposition of the king, that it is even repugnant to the common sense of men. For who

would not smile, that nothing stronger is brought for our christian faith by such Samsons, than length of time, and the usage of many men? By what means shall we prove that the faith of the Turks is erroneous, which now lasts almost to the thousandth year, having sprung before Germany was converted to the faith? Is it sufficient that, while, removed by distance of place, we are not compelled to dispute with them, we should in the mean time have leave to trifle in our own corners as we like. So also—who might not justify the Jews by the example of this invincible Thomist, since they excel us by so great a length of time.

And why shall not the nations throughout the new world be said deservedly, on the authority of Henry of England, to have attained the faith of Christ, since their idolatry, by this most beautiful and Thomistical argument, ought to be accounted the right and sound faith; because it is confirmed by so many thousands of years, by so many nations of people, and by such constant usage. And, on the authority of the same Henry our master, let us likewise assert that the errors of impious men are the sound faith, because from the beginning of the world their multitude and duration in power hath exceeded the fewness and inconsiderableness of the pious.

In fine—if the words of men are sufficient to found articles of faith, why may not my words constitute articles of faith? Am I not a man? But by this new wisdom of the king we may compel all men to believe the words of all. And let the king himself, also, that he may be relieved of the care of writing, follow his own principle and say,—“I am a man who thus speak; therefore it must needs be so and cannot be otherwise.” Foolish, ridiculous, and most truly Henrician and Thomistical are such things; as if a spiritual matter were to be measured by prescription of time,\* and use, or right of men, like a farm or a field.

\* And yet this is the grand foundation of *all* Establishments—not their scrip-

But if they shall say that *their* prescription differs in this from that of these persons, because the prescription of the papists is from the Holy Spirit, but their's is of men ; the Turk will laugh at such a futile distinction, and will say, Since you assert this without the scriptures, and without any certain signs, by the mere authority of men, it is just as if I were to say that my faith also is of God ; and by the same facility with which you despise me, I also despise your faith ; by the same authority as you prove your's, I also prove mine. What will be done now, but that very fools may understand that these Henrician Thomists, through their singular ignorance, have exposed our faith to laughter, and confirmed the impiety of all nations, worthy indeed to have their mouth, tongue, and hands cut off, lest they should speak, or write any thing more for ever.

But this is the object of restless Satan, that he may draw us away from the scriptures by wicked Henries and sacrilegious Thomists, and may place our faith on the lies of men. For there would be no need of the sacred scripture, if we could find sufficient confirmation in the sayings of men beside the scripture. But we, in imitation of those worthy defenders of the popish church, say thus, Let him be anathema and accursed, who would lay any other foundation for our faith, than that which hath been laid ; for Paul (1 Cor. ii) establishes with great authority that our faith ought to rest on the word of God, when he says, " My speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power : that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the

tural character—not their efficiency for the purposes for which they profess to be designed—namely, the religious instruction of the people—but length of usage, and prescription of time : as if an admitted evil were any better for its antiquity ; and as if men had an absolute right to lord it over the consciences of others, because their forefathers had done so before them ! Foolish, ridiculous, and most truly Henrician and Thomistical are such things indeed. From Rome they came, and to Rome again let them go.—Ed.

power of God." With this lightning and thunder of heaven, he shakes and disperses, as the wind does the dust, all the subterfuges of this Henry in his most stupid book. For what does this foolish Henry write except the enticing words of man's wisdom, whilst he shews nothing of the spirit, nothing of power, but pleads length of usage, the sayings and doings of men, daring even with his impudent mouth to require that we place our faith on these human things, raging openly against this divine saying of Paul. Let it be accursed, therefore, and doubly accursed, not only what this foolish king attempts, but also the whole body of that Behemoth, the kingdom of the Pope with all his dogmas, by which they endeavour to draw us away from our God, and to pluck his word out of our hearts.

Let us then adhere to the defender of our church, who says (Matt. xvi) I will build my church, not on length of time, nor on a multitude of men, nor on "So it ought to be," nor on custom, or the sayings of saints, nor lastly on John the baptist; nor on Elias, Isaiah, or Jeremiah, or any of the prophets, but on this only and solid rock,—on Christ the Son of God. Here is the strength of our faith. Here we are safe against the gates of hell. Here is no room for the lies and deceits of any lying man; and saints, when they act or speak beyond this Rock, are but men. This most pure and only certain word of God must be made the foundation of our faith. If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; and let every prophecy be according to the analogy of faith. (Rom. xii.) These are our strong-holds, against which Henries, Thomists, Papists, and whatever else there is of the dregs, filth, and off-scouring of impious and sacrilegious men of that kind, must needs be silent. Nor have they what to answer here, but lie confounded and prostrate before the words of this thunder. And we are waiting also to hear what this babbling king with all his sophists will dare to mutter against these things; for that sentence stands fixed, that our faith ought not to rest except on the

certain word of God, as saith the apostle (Rom. x), “ Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ.” Hence whatever is brought forward beside the word of God, let this be at our will as lords to believe or not believe, to condemn or approve, as it is written : “ All things are your’s, whether Apollos or Cephas, or Paul ; but ye are Christ’s.” If thus we be Christ’s alone, who is that foolish king, that goeth about by his lies to make us the Pope’s. We are not the Pope’s, but the Pope is our’s ; it is not our business to be judged by him, but to judge him ; for the spiritual man is judged by no one, and he himself judgeth all men, because of that truth, “ All things are your’s :” even the Pope ; how much more that filthy and foul stain of men, of a Thomist and king.

Although I also am a fool, and weak enough to inculcate on these mad and deplorable brains so often in vain, and to be always reiterating to deaf and hardened ears without effect, that the traditions of men or long usage avail nothing in matters of faith. For how often have I quoted that sentence of Augustine, that that honour is due only to the canonical scriptures, to believe most piously that there is no error in them ; that others, with whatever sanctity and doctrine they may be endued, are not worthy of equal honour. But even if Augustine had not said this, yet scripture requires that we give credit to nothing but itself. In vain, I say, have I been singing these things to deaf adders, who without end are prating and repeating their dirges,—“ Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome have so said, therefore Luther is a heretic, because the words of Augustine and Ambrose are articles of faith.” Whereas these holy men wished nothing less than this sacrilegious worship of Henries and apes, that their sayings should be made equal to articles of faith, but wished rather that all their sayings should be freely submitted to the judgment of every believing man. Moreover these swine of Thomists are compelled to grant that holy men have often erred ; so that their authority, even in the judgment of com-

mon sense, cannot be sufficient for confirming our faith and upholding our conscience.

Let this then be my general answer against those royal principles of the Thomists on which this kingly book wholly depends, namely, length of time and multitude of men. Perhaps these most subtle Henries will yet make holy angels of devils, since length of time from the beginning of the world is patronized by them as a most Thomistical principle of truth; then Satan so excels in the multitude of his adherents, that he is even called by Christ the prince of this world, and by Paul—the god of it, and the ruler of its darkness. Such then as are these Henrician principles and articles, such is his faith and verity; and such as his faith, such also are his saints: that is to say, Babylon, and an abomination worthy of these last times.

Let us now come to the particulars of our Henry, and let us see how happily he applies his principles to his conclusions with that Thomistical wisdom of his. But, first, I must ask pardon of the pious and candid reader, if I should be troublesome in repeating so often the same things, and refuting the traditions and usage of men. What else can I do when this Thomistical king, throughout his whole book, brings nothing but the doctrines and customs of men. He scarcely adduces one scripture, and that corruptly, to establish the Sacrament of Orders, forsooth, as we shall see. If it is not troublesome to read constantly, in this foolish king, “So it ought to be;” “So I think;” “Such is the custom;” “So the church teaches;” “Are you the only wise man in the world;” &c.; let it not be troublesome, I beseech you, to read also so often, “It is nothing that you think so;” “Custom proves nothing;” that “So it ought to be is nothing to the purpose;” “That church is not Christ’s church;” “It is not I but Christ who is the only wise,” &c. Necessity compels me to answer this foolish king thus in detail, who in detail thus argues.

In the first place this royal Defender lays hold of indul-

gences, which I had asserted to be the impostures of Romish wickedness. These he defends in this manner:—If indulgences are impostures, not only are preceding popes impostors, but, also, Leo the tenth himself, whom yet Luther highly commends. O royal and Thomistical wisdom; which again commends to us that proverb, that he must have been born either a king or an idiot. If Luther has such authority that so great a king may believe him commanding Leo the tenth, why does he not believe the same Luther when he condemns indulgences, especially when this last opinion is fortified by scripture, reason, and facts; while the other is but the courtesy of kindness toward an individual. But this Thomistical mask would fain further his own cause, having resolved to follow, not scripture nor reason, but the bare sayings of men. Therefore this Thomistical king makes no answer to my condemnation of indulgences, but this one word—"Indulgences are not impostures because Leo the tenth is a good man, therefore it ought to be so and cannot be otherwise." By the help of this royal and Thomistical argument, you might say, "There is nothing amiss done in the court of the Pope at Rome, because Leo the tenth is a good man." And so on the authority of our master, this famous Henry, king of England, you might justify all the abominations of Romish perdition. The same argument my Sylvester, also, made use of before him, because he also was a Thomist. But if in this place I should handle that nicety, how it is one thing to be a good man, another to be a good citizen, and another, again, to be a good prince, as their Aristotle teaches, it would be altogether in vain with such stupid and dull blockheads. How much less would they apprehend it, if I were to treat of this matter according to the divine scriptures; for, in truth, he is not a good man who cannot be a good prince; for the Spirit of Christ, by whom alone we are good, makes a man perfect, furnished unto every good work, as Paul to Titus teaches; which, also, the historical scriptures prove. With men that subtlety

has place,—It is one thing to be a good man, namely, in appearance, and another to be a good prince, in appearance, likewise. But Saul as soon as he ceased to be a good man, ceased, at the same time, to be a good king.

Therefore this is nothing to the purpose against me, that I have praised the character of Leo the tenth, and condemned indulgences. There is here a double judgment; we may not judge a man although he be of the worst in the sight of God, as long as he lives openly without crime, for this judgment belongs to Him who is the searcher of the heart and reins. It is another thing to judge of indulgences which pertains to doctrine, in which as both good and bad men, whether they be truly or feignedly good, yea and the elect may err, so they will not persist in error unless they are manifestly wicked. This judgment belongs to every one and to each, that we may discern the voice of the Shepherd and of strangers. But, concerning Leo himself, I am to this day at an uncertainty what are his own opinions, and whether he be pertinacious in error. Nor am I ignorant who is the author of that last bull of Leo's. But why do I cast these spiritual and precious things before such swine? What can he apprehend of these things who does not perceive that this is a most absurd syllogism:—Leo is a good man, therefore indulgences are true?

Let us come to another thing respecting the popedom; which I have shaken with most powerful scriptures. But its Defender, more mute to my scriptures than a fish, with royal confidence presumes that Luther will forsake the scriptures at his nod alone, and give in his adhesion to his lies. But he proves the popedom in this manner:—It must needs be so, because I have heard that India, also, submits itself to the Roman Pontiff; likewise Greece; also St. Jerom acknowledges the Romish church for his mother. What will this Luther dare to answer against such famous and Thomistical arguments? I reply, If the popedom shall stand on that account, because the King of England hath heard that India

and Greece have submitted themselves ; for the same reason it shall not stand, because Luther hath heard, and is well assured, that neither India nor Greece were ever under the Roman Pontiff or wished to be. Then, again, this vain glorious king, our master, according to his manner, lies with sufficient boldness when he makes Jerom an asserter of the papacy, since that man calls the Romish church his mother only, and not the mother of the world; and writes with more bitterness than common against the ambition of that monarchy. But this king, having more respect to his own honour than the cause which he maintains, as becomes a Thomistical mask, omits the scriptures, which are absolutely needful in maintaining matters of faith, and, in the mean time, tells us what he had heard, that we may suspend faith and the salvation of our souls on his hearing.

Thus far the King of England may seem to have been joking, like some rude and unlearned layman, if it please him ; now he becomes serious, and addresses himself to the argument which he hath undertaken, to defend the seven sacraments ; and first, the sacrament of the altar, in which I have detected three pieces of tyranny : one, that the one part is taken away from christians ; another, that they are urged to believe, as a necessary article of faith, that the bread and wine cease after consecration ; and a third, that they have made a work and sacrifice of it. Here then I have to deal, not with the ignorance and dulness, but with the obstinate and impudent wickedness of this Henry. Here he not only lies, like some most light buffoon, but in these serious matters he now ventures, and then flies ; he now feigns, then corrupts ; then distorts ; says or suppresses all things according to his mere pleasure. So that he equals at least, if not exceeds, the most wicked profligate. Read my little book on the Babylonish captivity, most dear reader, and you will see that I speak truth, for I have written more strongly than I now can write, which, that this virulent and wicked Thomist hath perceived, this is a proof, that he hath

left my best and most powerful scriptures, and reasons likewise, untouched, endeavouring in the meantime to divert pious readers by his most foolish book, lest they should read mine and detect his wickedness.

I honestly confess that I was something moved, when, on comparing his book with mine, I found how wickedly he passed over my strong points, and trumpeted forth his defence of the sacraments against Luther. In truth, this kingdom of the papists, born of falsehood, can do nothing in accordance with its own disposition, but perpetually lie, deceive by false pretences, walk upon straws, and glory, and boast triumphs in all these things.

But come, let us discover this impious and royal wickedness in their first piece of tyranny, namely, the one part of the sacrament. I proved that one part was impiously taken away from christian people, by seven arguments; which both then convinced me, and now also triumph, after this vain-glorious defender of the papists hath left them untouched in his royal fortitude. First, was the authority of the evangelists, relating in one consistent narrative, that Christ appointed both kinds to those who would make remembrance of him, and specifically added to the cup, "Drink ye *all* of it." To this our king defender of the church says nothing, The second was, that if Christ had given the sacrament to presbyters alone in the supper, that it would not be lawful to give any part of it to laymen, since it were not lawful to change the institution and example of Christ. Here this vain-glorious defender, the King of England, is silent. The third, if one part of this sacrament can be taken away from laymen, a part of baptism also and of repentance may be taken away by the same authority; and whatever Christ hath at any time ordained may be partly taken away. If it cannot, neither can this part of this sacrament. To this our vain-glorious asserter of the sacraments is dumb. The fourth, that Christ says, his blood was shed for the remission of our sins; therefore to whom remission of sins is given,

to them cannot be denied the sign of remission which Christ hath given them. To this this masked Thomist of England is silent. The fifth, if he could take away the wine, he might take away the bread also, and so the whole sacrament; and so make void the institution of Christ altogether. If he cannot take away the whole, neither can he take away a part. Here this invincible king perhaps remembered the proverb,—“Silence is an answer to many things,”—and by silence he dissolves all my arguments. The sixth, what necessity for both kinds being denied to the laity, when yet they all grant the thing itself; so that they teach us that as much is given under one kind as under both. If they grant that thing which is the greater, why do they deny the other sign of the same thing as they pretend. But this argument was a troublesome business to this so illustrious defender of the faith. The seventh is, Paul stopping the mouths of all, where (1 Cor. xi) he delivers the whole sacrament, not to Presbyters, but to the church and all the faithful. This argument he uttered to the defender of the sacraments. *Noli me tangere.*

Have you sufficiently seen the wretchedness of this defender? Now consider whether there can be one drop of royal blood in such a body, or a spark of goodness in his soul. Whom, I ask, does not this more than sophistical malice and impudence inflame, which thus rages designedly and of purpose against acknowledged truth, so that he wishes it extinguished and buried, not only for himself, but for the whole world? He is evidently a chosen vessel of Satan, and a most worthy defender of the popish church. With that earnestness he devises many other things also throughout his whole blasphemous and sacrilegious book; and the pious reader may learn by this mark to beware of him as a sink of death, and to hold him suspected through all his points. He is worthy of no pardon, because here is no error, but mere wickedness and hardened malice intent on lies and blasphemy.

But this speechless Defender in things necessary let us see how talkative he is on his trifles. Distend thy stomach, O reader, that thou mayest be able to contain his Thomistical magnificence, when he is about to prove that it is lawful to take away one part; how royally he walks, as if he were a king. The church, says he, communicates by the sacrament, in the morning, which Christ did in the evening; then, again, we mix water with the wine, of which yet the Scripture makes no mention: wherefore, if the church could in this instance act or institute otherwise, she could also take away a part of the sacraments. So this headlong and mad lust of lying against the Lord of glory, must needs be whirled and carried. How I wish that asses and swine could only speak, that they might judge betwixt me and Henry. But I will accept other asses and swine who can speak too much. Judge, therefore, ye sophists, yourselves, of Paris, Louvain, and Cologne, and your likes wherever they be. By what logic doth this most Henrician and Thomistical consequence follow, for you, also, have set your seal to the margin of this book. Here lies Luther prostrate, and you have approved your Henry. Tell me, therefore, where is the place? whence the rule of this consequence? Something is done beyond the scripture, therefore it is to be considered as contrary to scripture. Wine is mixed with water beside the testimony of scripture. Therefore the scripture, ordaining the other part, is to be condemned, to be held for heresy, and to be bespattered with your other mad blasphemies. Are you not ashamed of your effrontery, O Henry, no longer a king, but a sacrilegious robber toward the divine and sacred words of Christ? Do you not sweat, ye virulent sophists, behold how miserable Luther lies prostrate. Ye wretched blockheads, so given up are you to a reprobate sense, that you affirm this to be the principal strength of this royal book, which the very stones cry out against as the height of blasphemy.

I will here imagine some sorts of fools or madmen, that I may set off my king more fully in his own colours. If any

one should contend, that because he should prove something contrary to scripture to be done, therefore scripture ought to give way ; as, for instance, adultery is committed, therefore the law prohibiting adultery is heretical ; I believe that such an one would seem mad to my king, although he be most mad himself. Yet how much more wisely would such an one reason, than this my Henry does, since, if scripture is to be set aside at all, by any thing done, it is abrogated by nothing better than a contrary fact. But my king, that he may surpass all madness, proves that scripture is to be abrogated by an irrelevant fact ; for that water is mixed with wine, is no more contrary to both parts of the sacrament, than it is to the creation, or to the nativity of Christ. If, therefore, the king reasons rightly, “ Wine is mixed with water, without the scriptures, therefore the scripture is to be forsaken in one part of the sacrament ; ” this syllogism will also hold—“ Wine is mixed with water without the scripture, therefore the scripture is to be abrogated in reference to the creation and to the nativity of Christ.” Therefore this vain glorious king teaches us that we ought to take away the scriptures and word of God, not only by a contrary fact, but, also, by one irrelevant ; and unless we consent to him, he would be the only christian, yea, defender and maintainer of the church, and we all heretics ; and this reward, indeed, of his error, as was fitting, hath my king received in himself.

But I will imagine another fool, also, if any one should contend that any one place of scripture is heretical, because another place of the same scripture was produced, nothing contradictory, but only irrelevant ; as if he should say that John the Baptist was not the precursor of Christ, because Jethro advised Moses to establish a civil polity : perhaps here, also, my king would either laugh or pity the madness of the man. But there is no comparison of this with the madness of the king, for if irrelevancy can change any thing of scripture, an irrelevant scripture would do this more properly to itself, than an irrelevant fact beside the scripture ;

for that wine is mixed with water is a fact quite beside the scripture, and has nothing to do with a part of the sacrament. And yet my king, on the evidence of the sophists, hath by this syllogism overthrown miserable Luther, and hath merited to grant indulgences, a reward certainly most worthy of such wisdom. Therefore you will have erred nothing in future, if you argue thus—"Henry is king of England, and yet neither God hath known it nor the scripture made mention of it, therefore Christ was neither born nor suffered, yea the whole scripture is nothing." But I am unwilling, here, that it should be entered by me, on the margin, "Here lies the King of England overthrown;" because I am unwilling that he should be overthrown by words rather than the evidence of the thing. What, therefore, shall we gather from all these things? this, forsooth, that the thoughts of wicked hearts are revealed by this mark of contradiction, for therefore have they fallen into this depth of absurdity and horrible excesses, that they account the divine scriptures for some human thing, such as the mixture of water and wine, nor have any greater reverence for it; therefore it so confounds them who have not honored and glorified it as the divine scripture.

But what have these swine to do with the scriptures; let us descend to their own arena, and let us convict them of being ignorant of their own matters. Let this boastful asserter of the sacraments tell us, then, whence is it proved that the mass must be celebrated, of necessity, in the morning? or how is it contrary to the institution of Christ, if it be celebrated in the morning, because he did it in the evening? I ask the same of mixing water with the wine; who made this an article of faith? who dare say it is a sin if any one celebrate it without water? Will Henry? whilst he alleges that so it ought to be, and does not believe that Luther celebrates it without water. Custom, says he, hath the force of law. I answer, Custom may have the force of law in civil cases, but we have been called into liberty, which neither can nor ought to endure either law or custom, when we have to do

with spiritual matters. Wherefore the lordship and regality of Henry hath ill learnt his logic, and in this place most incorrectly begs the question, taking this for granted, as if it were proved to be a divine and necessary article of faith, what is merely free and a human invention. No wonder, therefore, if the fall of his book be great, which he builds on such a sandy foundation. Wherefore we readily give up, to these papists and holy Thomists, those magnificent articles of their faith, by which they believe that we must communicate only in the morning,—that the sacrament is only to be celebrated in some holy place, or vestibule, as they call it, and other most weighty articles, and most worthy of these super-eminent saints. But we affirm that such faithful ones are mere infatuated fools, and we hold the communion of the sacrament to be free, whether by day or by night, in the morning or in the evening ; the times, seasons, places, vestments, ceremonies, are free. With us he doth not sin who shall eat or drink moderately before communion, which, also, Paul confirms, saying, “ If any man hunger, let him eat at home, that ye come not together (to the Lord’s supper) unto condemnation,” 1 Cor. xi. So Christ, appointing the communion in the evening, did not appoint the evening for communion, nor yet the morning, for he doth not say one word of times, persons, places, or vestments. Otherwise, if he makes the example of time an article, he will make articles, also, of the example of age, place, person and vestment ; and it will not be lawful for any, but such as are of man’s estate, as the apostles were, to partake of that supper, and then, not otherwise, than in the vestments of laymen. Lastly, it will not be lawful to give it to any women, not even virgins, since the scripture does not say that they were partakers. And who can reckon up all the absurdities which would have this king for their author.

But far otherwise is each part of this sacrament ; for Christ did not leave it free, but instituted it, and its use, by clear and certain words. And, to my apprehension, it were better

and safer that the water were not mixed with wine, since this is a mere human figment, and hath a sinister, yea the worst signification. For it signifies, not our incorporation in Christ, since the scripture hath not a corresponding sign, but that which is said in Isaiah (chap. i), “ Your wine is mixed with water;” that is, the most pure scripture of God is mixed with the traditions of men: and what is fulfilled to the uttermost in this sacrament, yea the wine is here changed altogether into water; for there is nothing of the word of God left in this sacrament. Not that I condemn the use in the morning, and the custom of communicating in sacred places, but we would reject the necessity. For we would, if any one cannot fast, or fasting cannot be free from infirmity of one kind or other, he should eat and drink before he partake of the Lord’s table, and do it freely, that he may be as composed as possible, both in body and mind. For what Henry calls the church, we say is the purple harlot, for the church, although it cannot be without rites and ceremonies, does not yet make of them laws and snares of souls; but they do this, who boast this name of the church,—those swine and asses, —Henricists, papists, sophists, Thomists and deceivers, and antichrists of that description.

Thou hast therefore, reader, what thou oughtest to think of the wisdom of the King of England, whom thou seest, how foolishly and ridiculously he argues, that a custom of uncertain origin has the weight of an article of faith; a custom, both free and changeable, against the open, admitted, and immutable word of the gospel. By which thou mayest learn at the same time, in what contempt he held the word of God, whilst inflated with the name and majesty of his crown, he composed his little book against poor and helpless Luther. But thou seest in part the judgment of Christ, how he nothing fears proud and blasphemous kings, but rather removes the mountains before they know it, and takes the wise in their own craftiness. I therefore pronounce my book concerning the Babylonish captivity to be most christian, as

the strength of which this timorous Thomist of a king hath not touched, and, playing against my rocks with vain and dry stubble, hath afforded a signal spectacle to the world, so that boys and purblind may understand his astonishing ignorance, dulness, malice and wickedness. Let us pass to something else.

In the fourth place, when I had shewn that it is not necessary to believe that the bread and wine are transubstantiated, this Thomist of a king rises against me with two weapons, of which the one is a saying of Ambrose, the other is that Thomistical battering ram, which is called, "Thus it must be." He introduces Ambrose asserting, that nothing remains but the body and blood after consecration. What shall I answer to such infatuated and impertinent fools? If I shall ask here whether the word of Ambrose be a necessary article of faith, the king will say "Thus it must be." If I shall say—Who gave Ambrose the right of framing articles of faith? he will repeat, "Thus it must be." And seeth not the blockhead that such is the word of Ambrose, as devours itself, since it is impossible that nothing should remain but body and blood after consecration, except, with those most subtle men the Thomists, form, heat, cold, and other accidents are said to be nothing; for we see these things truly to remain as something, so that we perceive palpably that Ambrose hath erred here. But be it so that Ambrose would have that the bread and wine did not remain, I will say, Ambrose hath leave to indulge in his own apprehension, nor did that holy man wish to bind the conscience of any with this word, as an article of faith, since he could not demonstrate it out of the scriptures. But as he thought in this manner freely, so he allowed others to think otherwise, except the Thomists, who it is right should be ensnared and troubled with their own lethargic dreams as articles of faith.

Another strong hold of the king is, because the words of Christ, says he, are clear, saying, "This is my body." He saith not, with this, or in this is my body. Here again I do

not so much blame the stupidity as the wickedness of this king; for thus like a thief he detaches the words of Christ, and leaps over my argument royally, as if he had a right to seize the words of God and place them at pleasure. He, according to the most rude and brutal philosophy of the Thomists, attaches the pronoun "this" to the predicate "my body." Then anon, as if he had conquered, he cries out—The words are clear, "This is my body." But in the meantime the crafty sophist suppresses the whole weight of argument with which I assailed that ghostly philosophy, for this I insisted on throughout the whole argument, that the pronoun "this" could not be attached to "my body" in that place. Nor had I need of such stupid swine to tell me that there was nothing but the body there, if the pronoun "this" had expressed nothing else.

But this most faulty beggar of the question, as is the custom of all the sophists, ought first to shew that the pronoun "this" belongs to the predicate, and to answer my argument. He doth nothing of these, but prates ridiculously, that Christ said not, in this, or with this, but, "This is my body." Might not I also with that most subtle subtilty of the Thomists say, Christ saith not, "The bread is transubstantiated into my body," as you masters of fables pretend. But the king ought to have laboured at this, when from the thread of the discourse I shewed that the pronoun "this" applied to the bread, and that thus the words plainly signified "This is my body;" that is, "This bread is my body;" for the text runs thus, "He took bread, and blessed, and brake, and said, This is my body," &c. You see here how all these words "He took, blessed, and brake;" are spoken of the bread, and the pronoun "this" demonstrates the same; because that very thing which he took, blessed, and brake—the thing, I say, taken, and blessed, and broken, is signified when it is said, "This is my body;" not the predicate but the subject is meant, for he did not take, bless, and break his body, but bread, therefore he means not his

body, but bread. These are clear words, which this wicked king hath suppressed, and insists on that naked proposition, "This is my body," applying the pronoun "this" to body, by his own temerity.

But this also is a signal proof of his Thomistical wisdom, that being asked a reason of this article of faith, since he knows that no article is admitted by me, except it be confirmed by clear scriptures, he yet brings nothing else than "So it ought to be;" "The words are plain and open." But what grammarian is so absurd, as to understand or gather from this expression "This is my body," that the bread is transubstantiated, except these dregs of Thomists, who have also taught us grammar. Why doth he not also say, by the same license, that transubstantiation is signified likewise in that expression, when it is said, "The revelation of John the divine?" For if it is enough for an article of faith to say in this royal manner "The words are clear," there will be no words which may not prove all things of all, especially when the blockhead shall hear that those words have been quoted by me as clear in another sense, and as foreign to his sense, not to say obscure. But our king Henry, being exhausted with his Thomistical subtily, hath dared also to require of me that I should prove that it is not transubstantiated. This infatuated Thomist, forsooth, must be taught the elements of argument, who, when he ought to prove the affirmative, requires of his adversary to prove the negative. Let us send these most learned men to the heretics, and to the Turks, to defend our faith, so that it may not be necessary to render a reason for the faith, but only to say "Prove the negative." O swine and asinine Thomists, although, as I have said, I have supported my positions strongly from the gospel itself, to wit, that what the scripture asserts is to be asserted among matters of faith, but that what it doth not assert is not to be so asserted, but to be held free; but it openly calls the bread the sacrament itself.

But thus far our royal Thomist hath philosophized. We

must now see how Thomistically he theologises also against my arguments. When I, against that Thomistical article of faith, had laid down that celestial lightning of Paul, the word, (1 Cor. x,) where he so openly calls the bread this sacrament, that neither the unskilfulness of the king, nor the wickedness of the Thomist, could find any escape of lying or evasion, since the words of Paul stand more clear than the light, "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of our Lord?" He saith not "the body which we break;" he saith not "that no remainder of consecration which we break;" or, "the accidents which we break:"— but "the bread which we break," as already blessed and consecrated. Here therefore the bread blessed is the communion of the body of our Lord. Alike to this is 1 Cor. xi, "He who eateth this bread," &c. Here our good and sweet Thomist, bringing nothing of scriptures or of reasons, but of his own "So it ought to be," says, that the sacred scripture is wont sometimes to call that which was or which is like as Exod. vii, the rod of Aaron devoured the rods of the Magi, that is the serpent, which was Aaron's rod. Thus he argues. You rightly lie against your own tribe, O foolish and sacrilegious king, who, with an impudent forehead, have dared to attribute to the infallible words of God, that they sound one thing and signify another. What a door, I beseech you, of blasphemy hath this madness of the king opened to all heretics and enemies of the faith. If once it were admitted that the authority of the scripture rests on slippery and deceitful words, what may not all masters of all opinions prove or disprove, maintain and defend? How much better was it in Augustine, who would not even admit a sportive or officious invention in sacred matters. But here the king gives us liberty, if any where the authority of scripture presses us, of eluding it, and so interpreting it that it may press us no more.

But be it so that this Thomistical king does not think his Creator worthy of such honour, that he should captivate his

understanding to His words, confessing rather that he knows not how a rod devoured a rod, than rashly corrupt those words. And that it should rather be true, that a rod is called a serpent which was a rod before, by which consequence it will follow that *that* is here called bread which is not bread but was heretofore. Is this, also, without the scripture, to be applied to all places of scripture, because it is found in one place? Relying on this Thomistical wisdom, forsooth, you might thus argue,—The scripture says once that the virgin is a mother, therefore many other virgins, also, must needs be mothers, although the scripture says nothing about them; in the same way as this man makes that bread should not be bread, because a rod is not a rod. So you might produce six hundred examples like this prodigy out of the scriptures. In truth this masked Thomist smells of the Arian dregs and filth, for they, also, when they were pressed by evident scriptures that Christ is God, with this royal and Anglican acuteness, said, in time of old, Christ is nominally, but not really God; that is, he is called God, but is not *born*\* God, in the same way as this new Arian dares blaspheme that bread is called bread by Paul, but is not bread. So this vain-glorious maintainer of the sacrament will easily defend the Manicheans who took away the reality from the words of God and substituted a phantasy.

Lastly, I also will make use of the king's art against himself, and will say, Your Thomistical transubstantiation is not transubstantiation, but is called so, or is like it. How will he hinder me? May I not trifle with his dozing as he trifles with the most pure words of God. But I prove it thus,—Because it is once read in scripture that *that* is called a rod which is not a rod, therefore I may, when I wish, both with and without the scriptures, by my own authority, deny the substance of any thing, and say that it is only a name, unless

\* Is not this a contradiction in terms? See "Letters of a Layman to the Lord Bishop of Durham," on this subject.

the example and authority of so great a king, so Thomistical, so subtle, and a defender so boastful, and to be boasted of, avails nothing.

Thou seest, therefore, reader, how light itself, every where and on all sides, is this Thomistical wisdom—this most rude and asinine barbarity. For it is the perpetual fault of these most sottish sophists, that they beg the question, and pre-suppose that to be proved, which they ought to prove. Then let them make to themselves images of the Lord's gold, as Ezekiel says, and let them adapt the word of God to their dreams. Then let them say, It must needs be so, because I say it, which is all one as if the scripture said it. O defenders, worthy of popish indulgences and sacraments ! But this is akin to that contrivance of Satan by which he transforms himself into an angel of light ; and as he wished, from the beginning, to be like the Most High, so he doth not cease to be ever contriving things like both the deeds and words of God, that he may deceive the children of incredulity. So he sports in his pope, when, as he assumed to himself the right of absolving vows, with a great boast in his decretals, he uttered this likeness with sufficient confidence, “ The firstling of an ass was exchanged for a sheep, therefore I will exchange a vow for another work,” as if the firstling of an ass were a vow. So this king babbles. A rod is called a rod, and yet is not a rod, therefore Paul calls that bread which is not bread. As if a rod and bread were the same. With which depths Satan need not inundate the church, since the sophists, received into the chairs, have begun to make use of this kind of doctrine and argument.

But the king shews his further dexterity, also, in this matter, as could not be believed of any but a Thomist. If, says he, Luther, takes the words of scripture so strictly, he will say that Christ, also, is wheaten bread in heaven, since He says, “ I am the bread that came down from heaven ;” also a natural vine, where he says, “ I am the true vine.” I have said before there is nothing born under the sun more stupid

and foolish than these Thomistical monsters, for what child would not laugh at this doting king here, except that for his singular wickedness and madness of blasphemy he is more deserving of hatred or tears? There is not so much sense or wakefulness in him as to see the difference betwixt his dreams and these words of Christ; for the very consequence of the words, the absurdity of the things, the contradiction of meanings, as well as his own interpretation, make him to speak of spiritual bread, as he says, " My words are spirit and life; " of which things there is nothing, in the word of Paul, speaking of the bread of the sacrament, yea, all things conspire that Paul should be understood of wheaten bread. Besides this immovable blockhead dares to assert here a similitude of phrase, which no fool could possibly imagine in this instance. But yet, in his Thomistical dignity, this king does so, according to their custom whose practice it is to omit the rule of understanding scripture, (which is to observe consequence, circumstance and contradiction,) and by taking and distorting any word, to assert any thing. Wherefore see here, I beseech thee, O reader, what thou oughtest to think of this most infatuated and foolish book of so stupid and silly a king, and at the same time what a total want of judgment, observation, and diligence there is in the whole Thomistical body, while all things are said, done, and transacted with such temerity, presumption, and incredible security, that they may kill both their readers and spectators with weariness.

Therefore my Paul stands invincible against these futile transubstantiators, and says, " The bread which we break," and tosses them on a double horn, first, because they can make their assertions with no reason or authority; then, because by their frigid solutions, they do nothing else but beg the question, most corruptly, and the most that they effect is, that it *may be* as they pretend: whereas they ought to shew both the fact and the propriety that so it is, and so it ought

to be; for no one doubts that God *can* transubstantiate bread, but that he does so they cannot shew.

And this most wise Thomist, I wonder why he does not transubstantiate the accidents also, since those words of transubstantiation, according to his understanding, signify the body of Christ only, "This is my body;" therefore there will be nothing there but the body of Christ, on the testimony of his Ambrose, wherefore there will neither be whiteness nor any other accidents. Or why does he not shew what hinders the bread from remaining in the same manner as the accidents remain? What necessity for annihilating the substance, and preserving the accidents? Is it that Thomistical one, only, "Thus it must be?" I pass by that most rhetorical contempt, whilst I adduced two most pertinent similitudes of heated iron and incarnate Deity, where it is neither necessary for the iron to give place to the fire, nor man to the Divinity. For although it is not necessary for me to maintain my own positions, yet I shall have given this defender enough to do, if I shall have shewn that his figment may be otherwise, therefore I can say that the body of Christ is so, in the sacrament, without prejudice to the bread, as fire is in iron, without prejudice to the substance of the iron, and God is in man without prejudice to the humanity, the substances being so mixed, in each case, that its own operation and proper nature remains to each, and yet they constitute one whole. So, I repeat, I may say, until the papists have taken away this resemblance, not by Thomistical contempt, but by faithful argument. For it is their business to prove the affirmative, before I can fail in one particular. For this is not to write a defence of the sacraments, to leap over and despise the arguments of an adversary, as this insipid Thomist does, but to shew that they are nothing and empty. Otherwise this defender compels them to be taken for invincible by his ridiculous dissimulation and timid flight.

But this is best and most beautifully Thomistical which is to be mentioned last and worthily, where our lord and master,

Henry, assigns that reason why the bread should not be said to remain, namely, that no substance is worthy to be mixed with the substance which created all things. Here, reader, for once admire the magnificence of this Thomistical wisdom; first, our lord Henry discovers, that in the sacrament the divinity of Christ succeeds to the bread, and that therefore the bread ought to give place, lest so unworthy a substance should be mixed with the creative substance. I beseech you, what heretic was ever so mad, as to teach that the bread is turned into Divinity? Hath not this very Henry, with his swine and asses, taught hitherto that the bread is changed into the body, not into the Divinity? Or will they attribute to the body and blood of Christ, only, that it may be called the creative substance. Behold how this foolish madness turns their sacrilegious minds, when they have once begun to depend on falsehood.

Then also this most genial kind of argument might well move Luther. The substance is unworthy, therefore it cannot be mingled with a more worthy substance. And so, forsooth, our faith in these matters depends on the worthiness and unworthiness of substances. We may conclude therefore, on the authority of the Thomists, that God is not man, because the human substance is unworthy to be coupled with the dignity of so great majesty. Let us deny that the Holy Spirit is shed abroad in the hearts of the just (that I may be silent of the justification of the wicked), because the heart of man is far too unworthy of the majesty of the Spirit. So this Henrician wisdom argues here "The bread is not the body of Christ, because the body of Christ being a creative substance, is more worthy than to be mixed with so vile a substance." Well and fairly, most Thomistically and Henricianly reasoned, if the unworthiness of bread doth not permit that it should be the body of Christ; and yet the dignity of that reason is greatest, which is found and prevails only in Thomistical brains and asses of such sort. But if I shall ask, bread being a substance unworthy to be mixed

with the body of creative substance, why therefore are the accidents worthy to be mixed and remain, when the god of the Thomists determines, that substance is better than its accidents in all its moods, except the way of knowledge, because it partly partakes of our defect?\* What will our lord Henry say here, this most subtle defender? Without doubt nothing else, but “ So it must be; I am a king, and if this is not enough, I am a Thomist, therefore it is true.” This is what they call worthy of themselves, for so it suits the swine, having exhausted the marrow of the wheat to eat the chaff and husks, and to boast the accidents instead of the substance of the bread. Yea Christ is here found to be true, who hath said, “ I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay or resist.” For thou seest sufficiently, reader, with what furious falsehoods these sacrilegious papists lacerate themselves whilst they endeavour to contradict me. This is the power of truth, to convict of falsehood those who slay themselves, and to take the wise in their own craftiness.

We have this article therefore, although not anxiously examined by me before, now much more confirmed by the papists’ own authority, that is, by their lies, and follies, and blasphemies; so that we may be most sure that it is the merest figment of the impious and blind Thomists whatever they babble about this transubstantiation; and that the words of God are to be firmly relied upon by the faithful, where he says in Paul, simply and purely, that the bread which we break and eat is the body of Christ. Wherefore that I may not appear ungrateful to the mastership of my lord Henry, I now change and wish to transubstantiate my opinion and say, I laid it down before, that it signified nothing, whether you think thus or thus about transubstantiation, but now having seen the reasons and most beautiful arguments of this

\* That is to say, we know more of the accidents, than of the nature of substance itself. Therefore substance may be said to partake of the defects of our knowledge.—Eo.

defender of the sacraments, I decree that it is impious and blasphemous, if any one say that the bread is transubstantiated; but catholic and pious, if any say with Paul, “The bread which we break is the body of Christ.” Whoever shall say otherwise, let him be anathema; and whoever shall change one jot or tittle even, though it be my lord Henry, that new and excellent Thomist.

Then comes the fifth head, the chief and corner-stone of this Henrician defence—that the mass is a work and a sacrifice. Here at length lord Henry is lord Henry, and the Thomist the Thomist indeed. And first perhaps he hath heard from some semi-rhetorician, if at any time he should perceive the strength of his adversary to be too much for him, that he ought to be laughed at and treated with contempt, that the stupid reader may believe that the adversary was vanquished before he was attacked by so great a rhetorician. So our lord and king, in a preface of great swelling words, pretends that he is weary of the refutation of so foolish and unlearned a Luther, denying that the mass is a work and a sacrifice. **TRULY SATAN FEELS HIS WOUND,\*** —and therefore in the bitterness of his soul, uncertain what to do, from mere vexation and impotence, he endeavours to irritate me with ridicule and contempt. But he who hath given us to know the thoughts of Satan, will give us, also, to mock the mocker, and to despise this despiser, and to expose with confidence the weak bombast of his foolishness. Therefore, if you desire threatening and contemptuous words, this king defender hath conquered Luther seven times over. Moreover, if you look at the matter itself, those are trifles which our neighbours and friends, the papists, have been chanting to us these three years in vain, namely, “that the mass is a work and a sacrifice, seeing that the long usage of many hath determined it;” “So the church (that is, the whore of Babylon) thinks;” “So it must needs be;” “Our

\* Rev. xiii. 3. See “Church of Rome Identified,” French and English.

masters have so taught ;” and, “ So the fathers have said.” This is that madness with which this angry king rages and clamours in this place, and foams ; not over-propitious, certainly, to Luther, if this were of any avail to the defence of the sacraments, and could terrify Luther. But that he should confirm this so received, so common, so approved, I add, also, so rich and voluptuous an article, by one particle of sacred scripture at least or by the words of God, or should overthrow my scriptures, “ This must needs not be,” “ Long usage hath not determined this,” “ The church thinks not this,” “ Our masters do not teach this,” nor did “ this belong to the defender of the sacraments.”

Yet lest our famous defender should say nothing, he adduces one reason, evidently the strongest, by which he hath hitherto given satisfaction to all that the mass is a work and a sacrifice. It is this : “ If the mass were not a good work, the laity would contribute nothing of their worldly gains for it to the clergy.” Be astonished, reader, at this royal and Thomistical reason, and as I said, evidently the strongest, for it hath moved many hitherto, and moves them to this day. Here lies Luther prostrate, and no one hath overthrown him so dexterously as the King of England in this book with this very reason ; for however unwilling, I am compelled to confess that this is so. Truly I say the mass is therefore a sacrifice and a good work, because, as the king says, the laity contribute of their wealth for it to the priests. Again, it must be true, whether Luther will or not, that the mass is not a good work, if the laity should not contribute their wealth toward it. That which the event was to prove, if the laity should cease to throw away, I mean, to contribute their money for masses, and it should be that that were a mass, whatever money would make so. Rightly and excellently hath the king spoken in this reason, and maintained the mass with an argument worthy of so great a defender. Therefore it is in the largess of the laity, and at the will of money, that the mass is a work, and whatever may be useful

to the priests. Remember therefore, reader, that no other argument hath been adduced by this royal defender for his mass excepting this. Do thou therefore judge, whosoever thou art, reader, what may be answered worthily to such furious mad monsters of deplorable perverseness. What harlot would have dared so impudently to boast her ignominy, as this most impudent mouth of a king boasts the avarice and impostures of the priests, and objects them to us for a reason of his so great faith. But the madness of a divine judgment so often alarms us, which by these horrid examples of wrath admonishes us to be humbly wise in divine matters, whilst it strikes those with the present punishment of insanity who are carried contrary to sound doctrine and clear truth. For I could not make this miserable king with all my power so foul and abominable a spectacle to the whole world as he makes himself by this his insanity. Learn, I beseech you, O miserable papists, influenced even by your own disgrace, to fear at length the judgment of God. What will be in future, if at this time he so severely confounds you.

Not less is the folly which follows, where, with many words he hath turned me to contempt (for he hath learned this chiefly with his rhetoric). At length he protests that he will leave that untouched which most of all was to be refuted by him, namely, my principal strength and capital argument, where I prove from the words of Christ that the mass is a testament and a promise, and therefore cannot be a work or a sacrifice. Here this unhappy defender, overcome with the strength of this argument, and miserably dissembling his conscience, not only passes it over, but protests he will pass it over, and leave it to others. O maintainer of the sacraments and defender of the Romish church, twice Thomistical, and by far most worthy of all the indulgences of the Pope; he might have been pardoned if he had passed over this my strength in silence, but to protest that he would pass it over, when he had heard

me assert my main and only confidence in it, and overthrow all his arguments thereby, this is so ridiculous and foolish, that nothing can exceed it.

Therefore by the special grace of our king defender, lest I should be again ungrateful, I assert and pronounce that the mass is neither a work nor a sacrifice, until another shall come and prove that a testament and promise of God can be a work or a sacrifice. But when he shall come, the king himself sees that it will be at the Greek kalends; therefore he hath left the subject untouched in security, seeing he should have been most miserably beaten and torn, if he had touched it. You would believe that so great a king either laboured under some injury of the brain, or that some enemy had put forth this book to his disgrace under the king's name. For who could imagine a greater madness than this, that the king should boast of his writing against Luther, and in the work itself should not only dissemble his strong holds and arguments, but in plain terms should declare that they were to be admitted by him.

But after our lord Henry the Thomist had proved in this valuable manner that the mass is a work, he proceeds in his strength also to overthrow the reasons of Luther: and first, he Thomisticizes after this manner—"He who cuts wood does a work; therefore he who consecrates does a work; wherefore the mass also will be a work: but if it be a work it is not a bad work, but a good work." Thus that vain-glorious defender of the sacraments. Here also lies Luther prostrate; I confess plainly that I am overcome with the immenseness of this Thomistical dulness, and am at a loss so to speak that these miserable men may in any wise understand me. I say therefore that the mass is to be understood in two senses; the one after the manner of Henry, and Thomistically as you see in this book of the king. The mass is the same thing as consecration, or pronouncing words of consecration; but that this is a work of ours, not even the dulness of the Thomists can deny; so far am I from denying, that our

master Henry hath conquered here. But this is a new definition of the mass, and a new exhibition, for I could not even in a fever, or a phrenzy, have brought myself to think so of the mass, and I wonder that these most copious Thomists have not confirmed this happy reason with five other reasons. For if to consecrate is the mass, to shout also and sing, to burn incense or wax candles, to cleanse the cup, to elevate the host, perchance also to sneeze and spit, and what not, may by this Henrician wisdom be called the mass. But we grant to this new inventor of words and things, that he may call the head of an ass or an hog the mass, for what does it signify that any thing should be so called by them, with whom words and things stand and fall at pleasure according to their Aristotle.

We confess, therefore, that the mass is a work in this manner, and sing our recantation. It repents us of so serious an error, whereby we were ignorant that it would come to pass that the King of England should call the mass so; otherwise we should not have been wanting in sufficient learning to have avoided this error, and to have cut off the occasion of writing so great a book. But this will greatly perplex the defender, that by this means the mass will not be a good work, unless the consecrator be a good man. For a wicked man does evil by consecrating, that is, by massing, as the king calls it; therefore it will not be lawful for a wicked priest to consecrate, yea he will not be able, since they will have a mass to be, of necessity, a good work. And that magnificent theology will perish at the same time, by which it hath been determined that the mass, even of a wicked priest, is always a good work, by virtue of the work wrought, though not by virtue of the operator; for our lord Henry receives the work of the operator, and not the work wrought, for a mass. But perhaps our king is too much engag'd either to learn, or remember, that theology of the work wrought, and the worker. Thus the enemies of truth must

needs confound themselves, and make themselves ridiculous for a reward of their blasphemies.

In another way, the mass is truly and properly, as we discourse of it, the very word of promise, with the sign of bread and wine annexed. For, if all other things were wanting, and you believe these words of Christ,—“ This is my body which is given for you,” you have, in truth, an entire mass. Then if you shall have received the sign with the same faith, you have received the full benefit of the mass. Whence it is most manifest, that the mass is not any thing of our work or word, but of Christ alone, giving as well the word of promise, as the sign, in bread and wine, and that the benefit of it cannot be in offering or operating, but only in receiving it passively. But how should this miserable defender know these things of our’s, when he is ignorant of his own lore concerning the “ opus operatum,” and, whilst he assails us, most shamefully confutes himself.

Then by way of defending the sacrifice of the mass, he thus Thomisticizes, “ Be it so (says he), let the mass be a promise, it follows not hence that it is not also a sacrifice, since there are sacrifices in the old law which were at the same time promises.” I answer, The king ought to have produced one instance, at least, of his Thomistical assertions, but now, according to his manner, he thinks it sufficient if he only write that sacrifices were promises under the old law, and then, by and by, “ Thus it must be.” But I perceive that some vocabulary must be produced for so foolish a defender, by which he may learn, first, what is the meaning both of a sacrifice and of a promise. Since a promise is a word, and a sacrifice a thing, as even a child may understand, it were impossible that a promise should be a sacrifice, or a word a thing. Alas! that I am compelled to waste my time with such monsters of folly, nor am worthy that men of understanding or learning should contend with me. Therefore it is a manifest error, to say, that sacrifices were promises under the old law, unless the king defender, with his Thomis-

tical lubricity, mean to speak figuratively, that the sacrifices promised, that is, signified things future in Christ. But this is not to defend the sacraments, but to sport and play with words ; since in this manner a promise is a sign, or a thing not a word. But we, in the mass, principally call a promise those words of Christ, forsooth, without which the bread and wine would be neither a sign, nor a sacrament, nor a mass. For, that we obtain promises by sacrifices offered in faith, is another thing, since we do not here dispute of the effect or signification of sacrifices, but of the very substance, that we may know what is and what is not a sacrifice.

This lord Henry wonders, also, what sort of preachers I have heard—"to write that there is nothing ever said, in sermons, of these promises ; whereas he hath heard, even to weariness, of a testament, of promises, of witnesses," &c. I answer, And I wonder that the stupidity and madness of the king should be so great, to have heard such famous sermons, and yet to have learned and understood nothing of the word of God, that it cannot be our work or sacrifice ; yet he repeats the contrary without end. For, if there were any spark of human reason in him, he could not deny that a seal of God, is a work of God towards us, and so that the sacrifice and promises of God are the word of God and not our work. Then this king of falsehood, who writes in this place that he had heard of testaments and promises of this kind even to weariness, afterwards babbles about the sacrament of orders, not only contradicting himself most shamefully, by saying that there is no promise in all Christ's supper, but with most impudent falsehood raging against the supper of the Lord. Thus does this madness and fury precipitate the papists, that they see nothing what they say, or against what they determine.

He dares also to assert, " That it is evident that it was done by priests, not only what Christ did in the supper, but also on the cross." I answer, Since our lord Henry only says this, and does not prove it, I say, on the contrary, that it is

manifest that the priests omit that in the mass, which Christ did in the supper; and do that which the Jews did to Christ upon the cross. Nor do I assert this, only, but prove it likewise, for he who perverts and extinguishes the word of God, he verily crucifies the Son of God, which all do, who make a work of a promise, since this is, verily, to turn the truth of God into a lie.

After this he urges me with that canon of the mass, in which the mass is called a sacrifice, by the authority of which he would, therefore, have me to be bound, because I have made use of its words. For those words, "As often as ye do it," &c, he says are not to be found in the gospel, but those, "Do this;" while in Paul the words are otherwise. Here behold unhappy Satan, how he creeps,—how captious he is,—how he seeks some refuge, but in vain, for he shall not find any. I have rejected, and do reject the canon; because it, plainly, contrary to the gospel, calls sacrifices what are signs of God annexed to promises offered to us, and to be received and not offered by us; for what this king says, that those words are not in the gospel, "As oft as ye shall do it," what boy sees not, that this so great a defender has need of his grammar; as if it were necessary that the evangelists should agree in every syllable, and establish that form of the sacrament which the papists have made so immutable and necessary to us, that they consider him guilty of mortal sin, and consign him to hell, who shall omit that little word—for. Thus do these Rhadamanthus' and Oeacus', forsooth, rave; the executioners of free-consciences; therefore, on the authority of grammar and common sense, I say, that it is the same which the evangelists assert of the supper, although they may vary in a few words; and that it is the same thing whether we say, "Do this," or, "As often as ye do it." And I believe that the Holy Spirit provided, by a special design, that the evangelists should write the same thing a little differently, and should commit that unpardonable sin against that papistical form of the sacrament, that they might set us

in security from future superstition, and the tyranny of impious men. Neither would he consecrate less truly, who should use the form of Luke, Mark, Matthew, Paul, than he who uses that impious and false canon.

But where I had written that a sacrifice and a mass are inconsistent, since a sacrifice is offered, but a mass is received; this audacious lord Henry dares to challenge Luther to the Bible, saying, "Where is there any sacrifice any where in the old law, which is not at the same time offered and received." Here this vain glorious defender boasts that Luther's chief argument is fallen, and triumphs in security. I answer, This is not my chief argument, but that which my lord Henry, in his Thomistical kindness, conceded to me above, namely, that the mass is a testament and a promise. This, I say, is my capital argument; yet, that I may suggest something to his triumphs, if my lord Henry had but once opened his Bible and looked, yea, if he had remembered the fifty-first Psalm, which he read formerly as a boy, if he is a christian, he would not have boasted of so Thomistical a triumph; since he would there have read of a holocaust than which there is no greater nor more famous sacrifice under the law. This certainly was offered wholly to God alone, and nothing of it was received from him. But, if my king would have a little common sense, I would turn the question of a triumph against him, and say, "Where is there, under the law, any sacrifice which was received and was not altogether offered?" Will he make a sacrifice for me of the shoulders, the breasts, and other things which fell to the use of the priests; or will this equivocating king again call this, to offer, what was brought by the people and the priests out of the fields, and was applied in the presence of the Lord; it is all one, truly, to bring and to offer with our lord Henry. But what is it to me what this talkative trifler pretends; it is enough for me, that under the law whatever was offered to God was all burnt, but what was not burnt, but was partly given to the priest, and partly to the people, was not offered,

but was separated from the offering, and was eaten. But what have these sacred things to do with profane papists, therefore in the cup of the Babylonish harlot there is no sacrifice which is only offered, for that is the bible of our lord Henry. Our Bibles are full of such sacrifices.

Lastly, he brings the sayings of fathers for establishing the sacrifice of the mass, and laughs at my folly who "would be wise alone above all others, which is most foolish." &c. Here I say that my opinion is confirmed by this argument, for this is what I said, that these Thomistical asses had nothing to produce but a multitude of men, and ancient usage, and then to say to one producing the scriptures, "You are the most foolish of all men, are you alone wise?" then "So it must be." But for me, the most foolish of all men, it is enough, that this most wise Henry can produce no scripture against me, nor overthrow those that have been produced against him. Then he is compelled to allow that his fathers have often erred, that his ancient usage does not make an article of faith to which we can trust, excepting in that church of multitude of which he is the defender with indulgences.

But I, against the sayings of fathers, men, angels, devils, oppose, not ancient usage, not a multitude of men, but that word of the Eternal Majesty alone, the gospel, which they themselves are compelled to approve. In which the mass is manifestly described to be a sign and testament of God, whereby he promises to us, and certifies by a sign his grace, for this is the work and word of God not our's. Here I stand, here I rest, here I remain, here I glory, here I triumph. Here I defy Papists, Thomists, Henricists, Sophists, and all the gates of hell, not to say the sayings of men,—however holy and corrupt custom.

The word of God is above all things. The divine majesty so weighs with me, that I care nothing if a thousand Augustines, a thousand Cyprians, a thousand Henrician churches were against me. God cannot err and deceive; Augustine and Cyprian, like all the elect, both could err and

have erred. Answer here, my lord Henry ; here be a man, thou defender, and write books. Your abuse is nothing, your accusations avail nothing ; I despise your lies, I fear not your threats. For you are amazed in this conjuncture, like a trunk, since otherwise you are nothing but words. It is a most shameful thing for so great a king to write so great a book, and to be unwilling to touch this my capital argument ; nor hath there been found who hath yet dared to touch it. As many as approach hither fly seven ways backward, who rush by one way forward with great force and triumphant clamour. It is marvellous how they wish to hurt here, and how grievous a spectacle this is in their eyes. But no one hath carried himself more prudently than king Henry, who about to destroy Luther protests that he will not touch this his strength. But I neither feel nor return thanks for so great a benevolence, yea rather ill fare his anger and wrath, if it *can* hurt, and doth it not ?

But I despise his fury whereby he inveighs against me, because I have taught that faith without works is the best preparation for the sacrament, and that christians ought not to be compelled to receive it, for they are the words of a man who thinks that men are made good before God by laws, not perceiving, more than that senseless stump, what is faith and works, and what laws can effect in the consciences of the wicked, for it is not for papists to know these things, but as Peter and Jude say, only to blaspheme things which they know not. For consciences are comforted not by laws, but by grace alone ; by laws, especially human laws, they are most miserably wasted and destroyed.

But in conclusion of this head, it is worth while to observe how anxiously he labors to make the traditions of men necessary against my opinion, whereby I determined that nothing is to be settled beyond the scriptures, or if it is established, that it is to be counted free and not necessary, since we are **LORDS EVEN OF THE SABBATH, THROUGH CHRIST THE LIBERATOR.** Therefore the king argues first,

thus, “ If nothing is to be observed but what is delivered in scripture, since it is not written that the sacrament was taken by Christ, it will follow that neither can priests take the sacrament.” Relying on this Thomistical hypothesis, he thus frames his syllogism against me. “ Priests take the sacrament of necessity, and the gospel does not enjoin this, therefore other things also beside the gospel are to be observed as of necessity.”

This is most Thomistically concluded by that rule of consequences familiar to them, which is called begging the question; for how necessary it is, under mortal sin, for the sacrament to be taken by priests, the king ought first to prove, since I say that it is free to be taken or not to be taken by priests, but it is necessary by the traditions of men and the custom of many. Wherefore this Thomistical king very well proves traditions by traditions, and a thing denied by that which is denied; for on such proofs alone ought the defence of the sacraments to rest, and the whole of this Henrician church. In the second place he argues thus: “ Christ consecrated the sacraments, not apostles, therefore it would not be lawful for apostles or priests to consecrate, because it is not lawful to establish or do any thing otherwise than according to scripture.” But if that miserable Luther should wish to escape here, and to say, Christ commanded the apostles to consecrate when he says “ Do this,” my unkindly lord Henry anticipates me by saying, that “ this is said of receiving, not of consecrating.” O Christ the Saviour ! what unheard of blindness and madness is in these men. If I should here ask my lord Henry, by what grammar hath your lordship learnt, what vocabulary hath taught us, that to do this, is to receive it ? he will answer “ Thus it must be,” because words are at will. But having dismissed these swine, let us say, Christ instituted the custom of taking when he said, “ Receive and eat,” as the words themselves most plainly testify; not indeed to those blockheads of Henrys and certain boys and half-witted persons. But he

instituted the office of consecrating by saying, “ Do this,” for to do is to imitate that whole action which he himself then did. And what shall I say to these sacrilegious monsters, who show by such arguments how through most impotent envy they have so written, that nothing can be imagined more foolish and absurd. For if this argument of a foolish king avails, it will not be lawful to imitate Christ in any thing ; for suppose that Christ did so institute the consecration of the sacraments, (which is a thing impossible,) yet he gave an example of consecration and willed it to be written. Unless our king would contend, that we ought neither to pray nor to do good nor to suffer, because nothing is written of our prayers, works, and sufferings. The immense folly of this most foolish king overcomes me with weariness.

Wherefore let us turn our pen to the chief head of his perfidy, which is a saying of Augustine,—“ I would not believe the gospel, unless the authority of the church moved me thereto.” This saying, these sacrilegious men so twist and pervert, that they attribute to the church, (that is to the Romish harlot, which has nothing of a church or christian but the name,) the right of making laws. To this our lord Henry adds, that he may urge me also, by the authority of some such expression, in my own words, where I said that the church has a right of judging certain dogmas. Now I by no means see that there is any need of this most blockish head of a king, more than of some vocabulary or book of dialogues, that he may begin to learn the use of words along with the boys, unless he does it of mere Thomistical wickedness, to make all words signify all things, so that the right of judging should here be the same, as the right of making or ordaining laws.

In a word, if Augustine even *had* asserted in round language, that any one has a right of making laws in the church, who is Augustine? who shall compel us to believe him? by what authority is his word an article of faith? I confess his

word has been received, but it is not sufficiently sure and certain; the right of making laws must be proved by a divine not a human edict. But now they corrupt the word of Augustine not a little, for he speaks of the church diffused throughout the world, as having a right to judge of doctrines. They attribute this to the Pope, who they themselves confess to be a member of the devil, and to err many times; nor do they give him a power of judging only, but also of making laws. Hence it is necessary that we should show these rude sophists, what is the difference between the right of judging or recognizing, and that of making laws or commanding. To form an opinion and judge of doctrine belongs to all and every christian, and so belongs that he were anathema who should hurt this right in one hair. For Christ himself confirms this right by invincible and various sentences. " Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing," Matt. vii. This word is certainly addressed to the people against their teachers, and commands them to avoid their false doctrines; but how can they avoid them, unless they know them? how can they know them, unless they have a right of judging? But now he establishes not only the right but the duty of judging; so that this one authority may be sufficient against the sentences of all pontiffs, fathers, councils, and schools, which have attributed the right of judging and decreeing to bishops and ministers alone, and have impiously and sacrilegiously taken it from the people, that is, the church royal, for Christ standeth saying, " Beware of false prophets." To this subscribes almost all the language of all the prophets; for what do the prophets, but admonish the people not to believe false prophets? and what is such admonition, but to declare and confirm the right of judging and determining to be in the people, and to admonish them of their duty, and rouse them against all the doctrines of all their priests and doctors. Wherefore we here conclude as often as Moses, Joshua, David, and all the prophets under the old law, warn and admon-

nish the people of false prophets, so often do they cry, command, confirm, and rouse the right of ascertaining and judging all the doctrines of all men ; but this they do in numberless places. Here our Henry or any foul Thomist has something to bark against them. Have we not stopped the mouth of these iniquitous talkers ?

Let us return to the new law : Christ, in John x, saying, “ My sheep hear my voice ; but the voice of strangers they hear not, but fly from them.” Doth he not here make the sheep judges, and transfer the right of judgment to the hearers ? And Paul, when in 1 Cor. xiv. he says, “ Let one speak, and the rest judge ; but if any thing be revealed to him that sitteth by, let the first be silent : ” doth he not here mean that the right of judgment is in the hearer ? So whatever Christ (Matt. xxiv. and elsewhere) says of false teachers, whatever Peter and Paul of false apostles and masters, and John commands of proving spirits, amounts to this, that the authority of proving, judging, and condemning is in the people and that most justly.

For each one believes rightly or wrongly at his own peril, and therefore each must take care for himself to believe aright : so that even common sense and the necessity of salvation, shows that the determination of doctrine belongs of necessity to the hearer. Otherwise it is said in vain “ Prove all things, hold fast that which is good.” And again, “ The spiritual man judgeth all things, and is judged of no man.” But any christian is spiritual by the Spirit of Christ. “ All things are your’s,” says he, “ whether Apollos, or Paul, or Cephas : ” that is, you have a right to make judgment of the words and deeds of all. Do you now perceive of what spirit were those sacrilegious and abominable councils, which, against so many lightnings and most plain sentences of the whole scripture, durst arrogate to themselves, as pontiffs, the right of judging and determining, yea moreover, of commanding and ordaining. Without doubt they were the devices of Satan, with which he hath inundated

the world with the operations of error, and placed the abomination in the most holy place, by a most secure tyranny, after the authority of judging was taken from the people, of which the false doctors were compelled to stand in fear; and the way was laid open, by the foolish and superstitious obedience and patience of the people, for the inroad of universal errors and abominations.

And that I may here remind my Henry, and the sophists who depend on length of time and multitude of men with their faults. First, he cannot deny that the tyranny of this right being taken away hath lasted above a thousand years. For in that very Nicene council, the best of all, they then first began to make laws, and to assume to themselves that right. And from that time it hath increased unto this day, so that nothing is more received, nor any thing more firm which can be proved by multitude of men and length of usage, than this right. Insomuch that no one, now a days, thinks it otherwise than sound, right, and divine. But here you see that it is a sacrilege and an impiety against the most evident and invincible scriptures of God.

Wherefore if so great an error, and such a sacrilege, hath reigned by so great a length of time, and such a multitude of men, either agreeing, or seduced, or approving, against the truth of God, I, once for all, wish to all sophists and papists that this their capital argument, concerning length of time and multitude of men, should be ground to the dust for ever, and their mouth stopped, that they may see why God is unwilling for us to believe any creature, however durable, and many, and great, but his infallible word alone. We have, therefore, without all controversy, the right of determining and judging of doctrines, or of proving them, as belonging to us, and not to councils, pontiffs, fathers, and doctors. But it doth not hence follow that we have at the same time the right of making laws, for this belongs to God only. It is our business to ascertain, prove, judge, and distinguish his law and word from all other laws, but by no means to make laws

or command. For neither doth it follow from the word of Christ. " Beware of false prophets," therefore it is your business to prophecy ; yea, as Peter says, " Prophecy came not by the will of man," and " No interpretation of scripture is of private individuals, but holy men of God spake by inspiration of the Holy Spirit." So it follows not, " My sheep hear my voice," therefore they shall constitute and make my voice ; yea, the contrary follows, I constitute my voice, but my sheep acknowledge, prove, and follow it so constituted. Wherefore we see here that all pontiffs, councils, and schools, which speak another language in the church than the word of God, only, are wolves, ministers of Satan, and false prophets. At the same time we perceive the eminent folly of our Henry, and all the Thomists who set their impudent mouths against heaven, and dare to say, in this sacrilegious book,— " Although the sacrament of orders is not appointed in the scripture, yet the power of establishing it is in the church." And how foolishly they have adapted that word of Augustine, which he speaks of the gospel being recognized and approved in the world, through the church, to the right of establishing traditions at the will of impious men. This is the way of understanding the sayings of fathers and of scriptures—these are they who write defences of the sacraments, (the multitude and duration of these, is the power of making articles of faith,) so dull and stupid, that they can discern no difference betwixt acknowledging and commanding.

But here, they will say, " If the right of judging and approving belongs to individuals, what bound will there be if the judges should disagree, and judge each after his own head ; wherefore it is necessary that there should be one by whose judgment the rest may abide content, that the unity of the church may be preserved." I answer, This cavil becomes none better than the Thomists, for I, also, ask, Where is the bound at this day, whereby all stand by the judgment of one pope ? Where is the unity preserved here ? Is this

to preserve the unity? To be united externally in the name of the pope, where abides the unity of hearts? Who is certain, in his own conscience, that the pope judges aright? But unless there be certainty there is no unity. Therefore, under the pope, there is indeed a shew of external unity, but within there is nothing but a most confused Babylon, so that there is neither stone upon stone, nor does heart join with heart; so that you may see how happily human temerity heals spiritual things by its decrees. The unity of the church, therefore, is to be sought in another direction. This is the unity which Christ lays down (John vi), "All shall be teachable of God;" "Every one who hath heard of my Father cometh to me." He, I say, the Spirit alone within, maketh men to be of one mind in an house. He teaches them to think the same, to judge the same, to acknowledge the same, to approve the same, to teach the same, to confess the same, and to follow the same. Where He is not, it is impossible there should be unity; and where there is any, it is external and feigned. Wherefore it is no concern to God that wicked men should be either united or not, who want the unity of the Spirit; to his children it is sufficient for external unity one baptism and one bread, as common characters and symbols, by which they profess and exercise the unity of their faith and of the Spirit. The papistical church places its unity in the unity of its external idol the Pope, but within it is divided by the most confused errors and all the wills of Satan.

Let us return to our purpose. We have therefore wrested the mass from this defender of the sacraments, and triumphed against him that it is not a work or a sacrifice, but a word and sign of divine grace, which he uses towards us for raising and confirming our faith in him. And we see how infatuated is Satan, that the longer and the more he rages against us and writes, the more insipidly and foolishly he dotes. For that book of the king, as it is of all which have been written against me the most Latinized, so it is certainly of all the

most simple and foolish, so that I could almost attribute it to our neighbour writers, who are wont to cavil so when they cavil best.

But the mass being overthrown, I suppose that we overthrow the whole papacy; for upon the mass, as on a rock, the whole papacy depends, with its monasteries, bishoprics, colleges, altars, ministrations and doctrines, and so with its whole belly. Which things must needs all fall with the fall of that sacrilegious and abominable mass of their's. So Christ hath begun by me to discover the abomination standing in the holy place, and to destroy him whose coming was after the working of Satan, with lying signs and wonders. O that miserable defender of the papistical church! O miserable church, which hath expended in vain its indulgences for such a book! Except that the wages are worthy both of the defender and his book; for such as are the indulgences, such is the church, such is the defender, and such is the book.

Thus much may suffice for the defence of the first sacrament, in maintaining which our champion hath chiefly laboured,—the lord Henry, is not ignorant that in this is placed the principal safety of the papistical kingdom. Other things I am compelled to defer, being overwhelmed with many other occupations, and principally with translating the Bible—a most necessary work; lest I myself should forward the designs of Satan, through too great a desire of refuting him, who by these insipid books thinks to hinder me, but shall by no means effect it.

Nor were it a great undertaking to refute the foolish Thomists in the rest of the six sacraments, since they bring forward nothing worthy of an answer throughout the whole six, except that one thing which he adduces about the sacrament of orders: namely, Paul bidding Titus to ordain presbyters in the churches: for in this place he would have the sacrament of orders instituted. But the Thomistical mask sees not either what I shall say, or what he will answer.

I have denied that orders is a sacrament ; that is, a promise, and a sign of grace annexed, like baptism and the bread. I have not denied, yea I have asserted, that there is a calling and an institution of a minister and preacher. Whether this be done by the authority of one apostle or priest alone, or of the people choosing or consenting at the same time, it signifies not. Though it be more properly done by the people choosing and consenting, as the apostles (Acts vi) appointed seven deacons. For though Paul bid Titus ordain presbyters, it does not therefore follow that Titus alone did this by his own authority, but after the example of the apostles, that he appointed them by the suffrages of the people ; otherwise the words of Paul will be at variance with the example of the apostles. What he perverts concerning the imposition of hands to the sacrament of orders, boys may see that it pertains nothing to that sacrament, but after his papistical manner he thus makes out of the scriptures whatever he pleases. The imposition of hands was then the visible conferring of the Holy Spirit.

And what shall I say, that he does not even understand the name of a sacrament, which he evidently shows when he handles that place of Paul (Eph. v) concerning matrimony, which Paul lays down of Christ and the church, saying, " This is a great sacrament, but I speak concerning Christ and the church." Nor does scripture suffer us to call matrimony a sacrament, since a sacrament, in the use of the whole scripture, signifies a thing secret and hidden, which you can attain by faith alone. But matrimony is so far from being a thing hidden, or perceived by faith, that unless it be done openly, before the eyes, it cannot be matrimony, since it is a union of the male and female, confirmed by an external and public profession and conversation. But it is no wonder that these Thomistical asses should thus dote, in whom God determined that there should be nothing sound or right. Although I have given in to this common usage, to call those

sacraments which are rather visible signs, and have only denied that they are called sacraments in the scriptures.

This is the sum of the matter; this whole book of Henry rests on—the words of men, and the usages of ages; and on no words of God, nor use of the Spirit, as he himself is compelled to confess. On the other hand, the sum of my argument is, that the words of men and use of ages may be tolerated and held, so long as they do not contradict the Holy Scriptures, but that we must not make of them articles of faith and necessary observances. If therefore king Henry, with the united strength and zeal of all Thomists, papists, devils and men, can show that the observance of human words is necessary, Luther is overcome by his own judgment and confession. For then at length I shall accept as articles of faith, whatever even the Thomists have commanded. If he cannot, Luther is conqueror. What else do they wish; for not even if they were to write a thousand times a thousand books against me, could they require of me any thing else.

For neither do I enquire what Ambrose, Augustine, councils, and the custom of ages say, nor had I any need of king Henry for my master to teach me these things, who knew them so well that I could even impugn them. So that the folly of Satan is to be marvelled at, which impugns me with these things which I myself impugn, and continually begs the question. I do not dispute, I say, what hath been said or not said, written or not written, by any one, but whether this saying and writing be necessary to be observed, whether it be an article of faith, whether it be equal to the words of God and bind the conscience. I enquire of liberty and captivity; I contend for liberty, the king contends for captivity. I have supported the cause of liberty, the king omits all reasons for captivity, and only babbles what is captivity. He makes us debtors and assigns no fault. Farewell, therefore, this foolish and miserable defender of Babylonish captivity, and his papistical church.

In fine, if my asperity toward the king offend any one, let him take this answer, that I have to do in this book with unfeeling monsters, who have despised all my best and modest writings, as well as my most humble submission, and have become more hardened from my modesty. Then I have abstained from virulence and lies, of which the king's book is full. Nor is it a great thing if I despise a king of earth, when he hath nothing feared to blaspheme the king of heaven in his discourses, and to profane him with the most virulent lies. "The Lord shall judge the people in righteousness." Amen.

FINIS.





*BY THE SAME AUTHOR.*

---

**ESSAYS ON THE APOCALYPSE;** with Illustrations from the Oxford Divines. 12mo, 2s. 6d.

**LETTERS OF A LAYMAN TO THE LORD BISHOP OF DURHAM,** on Certain Points of Doctrine hitherto but imperfectly developed. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

**THEOLOGICAL COURSE.** Series 1—On the Book of the Law, as illustrative of the grace of the Gospel. Series 2—On the Book of Revelation, as illustrative of the history of Religion.

London : E. Palmer and Son, 18, Paternoster Row.







